

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

SIMON BALDERAS, ET AL.

\$

\$ CIVIL ACTION

vs.

\$ NO. 6:01CV158

\$

STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL.

\$

This Filing Applies to: All Actions

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, Circuit Judge, HANNAH and WARD, District Judges.

PER CURIAM:


This phase of the redistricting case involves the Texas congressional districts following the 2000 census. After a period of deferral to the State of Texas as mandated in *Grove v. Emison*¹ and the failure of the State to produce a congressional redistricting plan, we are left with the "unwelcome obligation of performing in the legislature's stead."² We will describe the course of this litigation and explain the process by which we drew the congressional redistricting plan which we order.³

I

¹ 507 U.S. 25 (1993).

² *Connor v. Finch*, 431 U.S. 407, 415 (1977).

³ The Congressional Districts imposed by this court's Final Judgment shall bear the number 1151C, which is the next number available for public plans within the Texas Legislative Council's RedAppl 2001 computer program.



()

Voters and various officeholders filed multiple lawsuits in state and federal court challenging the districting of Texas' congressional seats and both houses of the state legislature based on the 2000 census.⁴ The federal cases were consolidated into the earliest-filed federal action, *Balderas v. Texas*, No. 6:01-CV-158, before this three-judge court.⁵ Pursuant to the Supreme Court's direction in *Grove*, on July 23, 2001 we deferred proceedings in federal court until October 1, 2001. We directed that the trial of any challenge to any state-adopted plan for congressional districts, or of any dispute over an appropriate plan to be adopted if the State adopted no plan, would begin on October 15, 2001. Any trials of the disputes over the districts for the state Senate and House would follow in that order. The record in each trial would rest on the trials which preceded it as well as its own. We prescribed the usual pre-trial tasks. All this was to reduce, if not avoid, any delay in the electoral process and to follow the specific command of the Supreme Court in *Grove*.

On September 12, 2001, the Texas Supreme Court determined that the Travis County trial court had dominant jurisdiction among the

⁴ *Balderas v. Texas*, Civil No. 6:01-CV-158 (E.D. Tex.); *Mayfield v. Texas*, Civil No. 6:01-CV-218 (E.D. Tex.); *Manley v. Texas*, Civil No. 6:01-CV-231 (E.D. Tex.); *Del Rio v. Perry*, No. GN-003665 (353rd Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.); *Cotera v. Perry*, No. GN-101660 (353rd Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.); *Connolly v. Perry*, No. GN-102250 (98th Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.); *Associated Republicans of Texas v. Cuellar*, No. 2001-26894 (281st Dist. Ct., Harris County, Tex.); *Rivas v. Cuellar*, No. 2001-33760 (152nd Dist. Ct., Harris County, Tex.).

⁵ Other three-judge courts had dismissed prior suits filed prematurely.

state cases to hear the various plaintiffs' redistricting claims and held that a state trial court in Travis County must decide the districting dispute. The Travis County court commenced trial on September 17, 2001. It heard testimony and arguments from all the parties, concluding trial on September 28, 2001.

On October 1, 2001, at the request of the state trial judge, we extended the deadline for the filing of any congressional redistricting plan to October 3, 2001. On October 3, the state trial court issued a plan, known as 1065C. No provision was made in our October 1 order for the filing of any new plan, although the state trial judge advised that he might modify the plan on or before October 10, 2001. The schedule we had provided did not contemplate major changes in the state court plan filed on October 3. On October 10, 2001, the state court nonetheless issued a new plan, known as 1089C. We immediately delayed the start of any federal trial for one week to October 22 at the request of the parties who pointed to the need for additional time given the substantial differences between the two plans of the state court. On October 19, 2001, however, the Texas Supreme Court vacated the trial court's October 10, 2001 judgment based on a violation of the parties' state constitutional rights and remanded the case to the state trial court.⁶ The Texas Supreme Court also concluded that

⁶ *Perry v. Del Rio*, No. 01-0988, 2001 WL 1285081, at *9 (Tex. Oct. 19, 2001).

1065C, the first plan of the state trial court, was not the baseline plan for this court to use, because 1065C was never adopted as a final judgment by the state trial court. The Texas Supreme Court acknowledged that the end result of the state processes left the federal courts with no choice but to proceed without the benefit of a state plan.⁷

As forecasted by the Texas Supreme Court, we proceeded to trial in Austin, Texas on October 22, 2001, without a state baseline plan in place. This court heard testimony and took evidence on congressional redistricting plans between October 22 and November 1, concluding with final argument on November 2. The parties filed post-trial briefs on November 7, 2001. After reviewing the evidence and the parties' submissions, we now turn to our decision implementing a plan for the redistricting of the Texas congressional districts based on the 2000 census.

II

Federal courts have a limited role in crafting a congressional redistricting plan where the State has failed to implement a plan. The limits are not to be found in the traces of the unconstitutional plan being replaced. "Although a court must defer to legislative judgments on reapportionment as much as possible, it is forbidden to do so when the legislative plan would not meet the special standards of population equality and racial fairness that

⁷ *Id.*

are applicable to court-ordered plans.⁸ Rather, the court must draw a redistricting plan according to "neutral districting factors," including, *inter alia*, compactness, contiguity, and respecting county and municipal boundaries.⁹ The 1991 plan as modified in 1996 is conceded by all parties to be unconstitutional, made so by changes in population disclosed by the decennial census, if not also for other reasons. In our effort to steer the required neutral course through this political sea, we have been assisted by the many distinguished political scientists who have testified in this case.

Dr. John Alford, Rice University professor of political science, detailed in his trial testimony a process drawing upon principles of district line-drawing that stand politically neutral. We found that process, substantially parallel to our preliminary thinking and that of other courts, to be the most appropriate for our judicial task.

Our decisional process accepted the reality that, as with so many decisional processes, the sequence of decisions is critical. Starting with a blank map of Texas, we first drew in the existing Voting-Rights-Act-protected majority-minority districts. We were persuaded that the next step had to be to locate Districts 31 and 32, the two new Congressional seats allotted to Texas following the

⁸ *Upham v. Seamon*, 456 U.S. 37, 39 (1982) (per curiam).

⁹ See *Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74, 88, 98 (1997); *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 916 (1995).

2000 census. As observed by Dr. Alford, the most natural and neutral locator is to place them where the population growth that produced the new additional districts has occurred.¹⁰ It is self-evident that this locator is, across cases, neutral down to the immediate area, if not in the ultimate, precise fit on the ground. Here the new districts' precise landing was virtually dictated by step 1. When we sent the two new districts to the areas of greatest population growth, Dallas County and Harris County, the districts necessarily landed in the northern half of these counties, and, in the case of District 31, continuing over to Williamson County. Their landing was directed by the location of the protected majority-minority districts in southern Dallas and Harris Counties, which could not be disrupted. Use of this neutral guide was further supported by the circumstance that the Texas legislature has previously located new districts in the areas of greatest population growth.¹¹

With a large part of the Texas map thus drawn, we looked to general historic locations of districts in the state, such as the districts in the Panhandle and the northeast corner of the state,

¹⁰ We are not the first court to see the wisdom of this choice. See, e.g., *Johnson v. Miller*, 922 F. Supp. 1556, 1563 (S.D. Ga. 1995) (discussing the decision to place Georgia's additional congressional district in high population growth area near Atlanta), *aff'd sub nom., Abrams v. Johnson*, 521 U.S. 74 (1997).

¹¹ See *Bush v. Vera*, 517 U.S. 952, 1003 (1996) (Stevens, J., dissenting) ("Because Texas' growth was concentrated in south Texas and the cities of Dallas and Houston, the state legislature concluded that the new congressional districts should be carved out of existing districts in those areas.").

the north central districts of the Red River area,¹² through the metropolitan districts and the central plains. We then drew in the remaining districts throughout the state, emphasizing compactness, while observing the contiguity requirement.¹³ We struggled to follow local political boundaries that historically have defined communities--county and city lines.¹⁴ In the vernacular, "splits" of counties and cities in our drawing had to be a product of our neutral standards and the demands of population equality. We eschewed an effort to treat old lines as an independent locator, an effort that, in any event, would be frustrated by the population changes in the last decade. Nonetheless, the districts fell to their long-held areas, a natural result of the process we have described, much the same as the map drawn at our request by the State using Dr. Alford's neutral approach.

As we have explained, in our efforts to avoid splitting counties and cities, and in particular "double splits," or simultaneously moving populations in and out of a county between

¹² Cf. *Johnson*, 922 F. Supp. at 1565 (discussing Georgia's tradition of having four "corner districts" in its congressional plans).

¹³ See *Good v. Austin*, 800 F. Supp. 557, 563 (E.D. Mich. & W.D. Mich. 1992) ("In addition to serving as a check on gerrymandering compactness facilitates political organization, electoral campaigning, and constituent representation." (quoting *Karcher v. Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 756 (1983) (Stevens, J., concurring))).

¹⁴ See *Karcher*, 462 U.S. at 758 (Stevens, J., concurring) ("Subdivision boundaries tend to remain stable over time. Residents of political units such as townships, cities, and counties often develop a community of interest, particularly when the subdivision plays an important role in the provision of governmental services. In addition, legislative districts that do not cross subdivision boundaries are administratively convenient and less likely to confuse the voters." (footnote omitted)).

two districts, we also strove for compactness and contiguity. Doing so did much to end most of the below-the-surface "ripples" of the 1991 plan and the myriad of submissions before us. For example, the patently irrational shapes of Districts 5 and 6 under the 1991 plan, widely-cited as the most extreme but successful gerrymandering in the country, are no more.

As a check against the outcome of our neutral principles, we asked if the resulting plan was avoidably detrimental to Members of Congress of either party holding unique, major leadership posts. We looked at three Democrats and three Republicans, consensus members of this limited group, each with substantial leadership positions in the Congress. It was plain that these Members were not harmed in their reelection prospects by this plan and that, indeed, no incumbent was paired with another incumbent or significantly harmed by the plan. We thus considered no change in our map in response to this inquiry. Doubtlessly some may see any such weighting as an incumbency factor since congressional leadership so directly correlates with seniority. This view is not without force. Nonetheless, three circumstances must also be considered. First, this correlation is no longer so complete. Second, it does not here offer purchase to one political party over another. And, finally, it reflects a traditional state interest in the power of its congressional delegation distinct from partisan affiliation.

Finally, we checked our plan against the test of general partisan outcome, comparing the number of districts leaning in favor of each party based on prior election results against the percentage breakdown statewide of votes cast for each party in congressional races. This is a traditional last check upon the rationality of any congressional redistricting plan,¹⁵ widely relied-upon by political scientists to test plans, if only in an approximating manner. We found that the plan is likely to produce a congressional delegation roughly proportional to the party voting breakdown across the state. It must be understood that any plan necessarily begins with a Democratic bias due to the preservation of protected majority-minority districts, all of which contain a high percentage of Democratic voters.

III

Various parties urged us to create both African-American and Latino minority districts. These districts are not required by law, as discussed in more detail below, but could be created by the State so long as race was not a predominant reason for doing so. Whether to do so is, however, a quintessentially legislative decision, implicating important policy concerns.¹⁶ We did not avoid creating such a district. At the same time, we did not depart from

¹⁵ See, e.g., *Good*, 800 F. Supp. at 566-67 (using partisan fairness to assess plan drawn according to neutral principles).

¹⁶ See *Wyche v. Madison Parish Police Jury*, 635 F.2d 1151, 1160 (5th Cir. Unit A Feb. 1981).

our neutral factors to draw any district not required by law. To do so would render our effort to keep our thumb off the political scale an illusion.¹⁷

IV

Finally, to state directly what is implicit in all that we have said: political gerrymandering, a purely partisan exercise, is inappropriate for a federal court drawing a congressional redistricting map.¹⁸ Even at the hands of a legislative body, political gerrymandering is much a bloodfeud, in which revenge is exacted by the majority against its rival. We have left it to the political arena, as we must and wisely should. We do so because our role is limited and not because we see gerrymandering as other than what it is: an abuse of power that, at its core, evinces a fundamental distrust of voters, serving the self-interest of the political parties at the expense of the public good.

V

The parties presented competing plans for redistricting the Congressional seats. We have passed by the approach by which these plans were created in favor of the approach we have described, which we found to be mandated by our position as a federal court

¹⁷ Cf. Abrams, 521 U.S. at 88.

¹⁸ See *Hunt v. Cromartie*, 526 U.S. 541, 551 (1999); see generally *Davis v. Bandemer*, 478 U.S. 109, 117 n.6 (1986) (plurality opinion of White, J.); cf. *Wyche v. Madison Parish Police Jury*, 769 F.2d 265, 268 (5th Cir. 1985) ("Many factors, such as the protection of incumbents, that are appropriate in the legislative development of an apportionment plan have no place in a plan formulated by the courts.").

engaging in our "delicate task with limited legislative guidance."¹⁹

Several parties raise Voting Rights Act arguments in support of their preferred plans. In drawing our plan, we have endeavored to ensure that the plan complies with the goals of sections 2²⁰ and 5²¹ of the Voting Rights Act.²²

Our plan works no retrogression. We have maintained intact the existing districts, and, to the extent the boundaries have changed, as we "zeroed out" the plan, the minority populations have been either enhanced or not diminished in any meaningful way (i.e., by mere fractions of percentages). Thus, although the minority populations in Districts 15, 16, and 30 represent a slightly smaller, but still overwhelming, percentage of the total populations of those districts as compared with the baseline 1991 plan as modified in 1996, we find that these changes do not result in "a retrogression in the position of racial minorities with respect to their effective exercise of the electoral franchise."²³

The Balderas plaintiffs argue that the congressional plan must contain seven Latino registration majority districts, within nine Latino voting age majority districts, to avoid a section 2

¹⁹ Abrams, 521 U.S. at 101.

²⁰ 42 U.S.C. § 1973.

²¹ 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.

²² See Abrams, 521 U.S. at 90, 96.

²³ Beer v. United States, 425 U.S. 130, 141 (1976); see also Abrams, 521 U.S. at 95; Reno v. Bossier Parish Sch. Bd., 520 U.S. 471, 478 (1997).

violation. The Martinez intervenors specifically argue for a Latino opportunity district in Dallas County to maintain compliance with section 2. Many parties, including the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats, argue for an African-American opportunity district, generally labeled District 25, in Fort Bend and Harris Counties.

The Latino and African-American plaintiffs thus present competing positions, reflecting a political reality that they are competitors in the political process.²⁴ This competition finds expression in an absence of cohesive voting between Latinos and African-Americans at the point in which it is meaningfully measured, the Democratic primaries.

We find that the plaintiffs have failed to prove that vote dilution will occur in violation of section 2 of the Voting Rights Act in the absence of seven Latino citizenship majority congressional districts or an African-American opportunity district, proposed District 25, in Fort Bend and Harris Counties. The evidence did not persuade us that either Latino or African-American voting age populations are sufficiently numerous to form voting age population majorities in effective districts.²⁵ The plaintiffs have also not proved that Latinos and African-Americans

²⁴ Several political scientists alluded to this political reality in their testimony.

²⁵ See *Valdespino v. Alamo Heights Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 168 F.3d 848, 852-53 (5th Cir. 1999).

vote cohesively as required by *Thornburg v. Gingles*²⁶ so as to constitute a majority in a single-member district.²⁷

Looking first to the proposed African-American opportunity district, the Texas Coalition of Black Democrats has conceded that the evidence showed that African-Americans would not be an absolute majority of citizen voting age population in the proposed District 25. Again, the plaintiffs were unable to prove cohesive voting between Latinos and African-Americans sufficient to compel the drawing of a district in Fort Bend and Harris Counties.²⁸ The overwhelming evidence found to be persuasive was to the contrary.

The matter of creating such a permissive district is one for the legislature.²⁹ As we have explained, such an effort would require that we abandon our quest for neutrality in favor of a raw political choice. We offer no opinion as to the wisdom of an appropriate body doing so. Such arranging of voting presents a large and complex decision with profound social and political consequences. The Congress has by its enactment of voting rights laws constrained the political process and given the courts a role--to the extent of those constraints. We have no warrant to

²⁶ 478 U.S. 30, 50-51 (1986).

²⁷ See *Valdespino*, 168 F.3d at 852-53.

²⁸ See *Grove*, 507 U.S. at 41.

²⁹ See *Johnson*, 922 F. Supp. at 1567 ("Since political considerations pervade the redistricting task, the Court feels that any permanent footprint left on Georgia's political landscape ... should be left to those elected to make such decisions.").

impose our vision of "proper" restraints upon the political process beyond the constraints imposed by the Constitution or the Voting Rights Act. The Supreme Court put it succinctly in *Grove*, stating that, where there has been no showing establishing the "three Gingles prerequisites," then under section 2 of the Voting Rights Act "there neither has been a wrong nor can be a remedy."³⁰ A month later, the Court stated even more directly that, "[o]f course, the federal courts may not order the creation of majority-minority districts unless necessary to remedy a violation of federal law."³¹

In sum, these arguments so ably presented by Morris Overstreet, African-American attorney and former state official and candidate for elective office, and others are directed to the wrong forum, however much we may personally admire the arguments. It bears mention that our plan has hardly left a bleak terrain. In District 25 of our plan, the combined African-American and Latino voting age population increased to a 52.3 majority. In the practical world, this percentage will dominate the Democratic primary in a district that has consistently elected a Democratic congressman. This is, then, in a real sense, a minority district produced by our process that enhances the elective prospects of a minority, albeit not wholly the district sought.

As for the proposed Latino opportunity districts, the evidence

³⁰ 507 U.S. at 41.

³¹ *Voinovich v. Quilter*, 507 U.S. 146, 156 (1993).

shows that the Latino population is not sufficiently compact or numerous to support another, effective majority Latino citizenship district in Texas, in Dallas County or in South Texas.³² We find that, under the totality of the circumstances, the failure to create seven such districts will not prevent full and equal Latino participation in the political process. It bears mention that our insistence upon compactness has increased the Latino force in District 24, a result supported by Congresswoman Eddie Bernice Johnson in her testimony at trial.

The Valdez-Cox plaintiffs also urge that Webb and Hidalgo Counties be left whole. We heard powerful arguments from the witness stand and counsel in opposition to a splitting of Hidalgo County in South Texas, and our neutral standards stood against such a county split. That standard was ultimately overridden as to Hidalgo County by the mandate of population equality under the principle of one-man, one-vote, and the existence of surrounding protected majority-minority districts. It is an ugly fact that the law's insistence on absolute population equality in court-drawn plans has the perverse effect of splitting counties and cities, when a tolerance of greater deviation would not demand such undesirable divisions. The split here of Hidalgo County is a fit

³² See *Grove*, 507 U.S. at 39-40; *Gingles*, 478 U.S. at 50-51; *NAACP v. Fordice*, 252 F.3d 361, 365-67 (5th Cir. 2001).

example.³³ Webb County was not caught in this squeeze and remains wholly intact in District 23.

VI

There being no reason for delay, we direct entry of final judgment in this case pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b).

So ordered and signed this 14th day of November, 2001.

Patrick E. Higginbotham
PATRICK E. HIGGINBOTHAM
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

John Hannah, Jr.
JOHN HANNAH, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

T. John Ward
T. JOHN WARD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

³³ We endeavored to and did respect the municipal boundaries of McAllen, a major population center of Hidalgo County.

Wed-11/14/01

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION


FILED

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

NOV 14 2001 10:37 a.m.

DAVID J. MALAND, CLERK
BY DEPUTY



SIMON BALDERAS, ET AL.

§

Vs.

§ NO. 6:01CV158

STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL.

§

This filing applies to:

All actions


FINAL JUDGMENT

On the 22d day of October, the above referenced civil action came on for trial. The court heard evidence and argument and considered the parties' post-trial briefing. For the reasons expressed in the court's *per curiam* decision issued today, the court renders judgment declaring that the existing congressional districts in the State of Texas are unconstitutionally malapportioned and adopting Plan 1151C as the remedial congressional redistricting plan for the State of Texas.

The Texas Legislative Council's statistical package for Plan 1151 C is attached as Exhibit A to this judgment and is incorporated by reference. The maps associated with Plan 1151C are attached as Exhibit B to this judgment and are incorporated by reference.

All relief not granted is denied. Costs of court are taxed against the State of Texas.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 14th day of November, 2001.



Pat S Higginbotham
PATRICK E. HIGGINBOTHAM
UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

John Hannah, Jr.
JOHN HANNAH, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

T. John Ward
T. JOHN WARD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Texas Congressional Districts for 2002 Elections
as Ordered by Eastern District of Texas
Federal Three-Judge Panel

November 14, 2001

PLAN 01151C

EXHIBIT A

RED-M100
Date: 2000 Census
PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBT_LS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 01151C

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 1 of 8

2000 CENSUS POPULATION			
	Population	Deviation	
		Total	Percent
Total State Population	20,851,820	32	
Total Districts Required	651,619	0	
Ideal District Population		32	
Unassigned Population			
Districts in Plan			
Plan Overall Range	651,619	0	0.00%
Smallest District (1)	651,620	1	0.00%
Largest District (3)	651,619	0	0.00%
Average (mean)			

PLAN 01151C

RED-M100
Date: 2000 Census
PLAN D1151C 11/13/01 10:56:42

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBTOTALS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 2 of 8

DIST	DEVIATION	Total:	2000 CENSUS POPULATION						%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O
			TOTAL	ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER					
DIST 1	0 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,619 485,236	486,592 374,219	107,955 74,888	48,013 29,320	155,095 103,695	9,932 7,322	74.7 77.1	16.6 15.4	7.4 6.0	23.8 21.4	1.5 1.5
Bowie (100%)			89,306	62,712	21,235	3,992	25,071	1,523	70.2	23.8	4.5	28.1	1.7
Camp (100%)			11,549	7,307	2,247	1,707	3,935	107	65.0	19.5	14.8	34.1	0.9
Cass (100%)			30,438	23,542	6,028	526	6,529	367	77.3	19.8	1.7	21.5	1.2
Delta (100%)			5,327	4,616	467	165	625	86	86.7	8.8	3.1	11.7	1.6
Franklin (100%)			9,458	8,129	387	842	1,220	109	85.9	4.1	8.9	12.9	1.2
Harrison (100%)			62,110	43,044	15,085	3,316	18,326	740	69.3	24.3	5.3	29.5	1.2
Hopkins (100%)			31,960	25,946	2,620	2,967	5,548	466	81.2	8.2	9.3	17.4	1.5
Hunt (98%)			74,894	59,585	7,541	6,290	13,721	1,588	79.6	10.1	8.4	18.3	2.1
Lamar (100%)			48,499	39,116	6,720	1,614	8,277	1,106	80.7	13.9	3.3	17.1	2.3
Marion (100%)			10,941	7,818	2,671	263	2,912	211	71.5	24.4	2.4	26.6	1.9
Morris (100%)			13,048	9,217	3,182	477	3,643	188	70.6	24.4	3.7	27.9	1.4
Nacogdoches (92%)			54,262	37,204	9,811	6,444	16,159	899	68.6	18.1	11.9	29.8	1.7
Panola (100%)			22,756	17,629	4,084	798	4,866	261	77.5	17.9	3.5	21.4	1.1
Red River (100%)			14,314	10,868	2,586	669	3,241	205	75.9	18.1	4.7	22.6	1.4
Rusk (100%)			47,172	33,737	9,232	3,998	13,153	482	71.2	19.5	8.4	27.8	1.0
Shelby (100%)			25,224	17,564	4,961	2,489	7,420	240	69.6	19.7	9.9	29.4	1.0
Titus (100%)			28,118	16,782	3,082	7,960	10,982	354	59.7	11.0	28.3	39.1	1.3
Upshur (100%)			35,291	29,728	3,687	1,394	5,048	515	84.2	10.4	4.0	14.3	1.5
Wood (100%)			36,752	31,848	2,329	2,102	4,419	485	86.7	6.3	5.7	12.0	1.3
DIST 2	0 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,619 484,519	492,448 374,394	92,315 66,023	57,568 37,183	149,069 102,747	10,102 7,378	75.6 77.3	14.2 13.6	8.8 7.7	22.9 21.2	1.6 1.5
Angelina (100%)			80,130	55,615	12,056	11,496	23,369	1,146	69.4	15.0	14.3	29.2	1.4
Cherokee (100%)			46,659	32,347	7,607	6,178	13,731	581	69.3	16.3	13.2	29.4	1.2
Grimes (100%)			23,552	14,772	4,768	3,787	8,510	270	62.7	20.2	16.1	36.1	1.1
Hardin (100%)			48,073	42,941	3,370	1,223	4,571	561	89.3	7.0	2.5	9.5	1.2
Houston (100%)			23,185	14,775	6,529	1,739	8,231	179	63.7	28.2	7.5	35.5	0.1
Jasper (100%)			35,604	27,320	6,440	1,384	7,779	505	76.7	18.1	3.9	21.8	1.4
Liberty (100%)			70,154	52,289	9,209	7,660	16,800	1,065	74.5	13.1	10.9	23.9	1.2
Montgomery (14%)			40,081	34,316	461	4,665	5,114	651	85.6	1.2	11.6	12.8	1.0
Nacogdoches (8%)			4,941	4,416	266	216	474	51	89.4	5.4	4.4	9.6	1.0
Newton (100%)			15,072	11,157	3,155	571	3,707	208	74.0	20.9	3.8	24.6	1.0
Orange (100%)			84,966	72,955	7,305	3,073	10,318	1,693	85.9	8.6	3.6	12.1	2
Polk (100%)			41,133	30,723	5,507	3,861	9,291	1,119	74.7	13.4	9.4	22.6	2
Sabine (100%)			10,469	9,115	1,059	189	1,248	106	87.1	10.1	1.8	11.9	1
San Augustine (100%)			8,946	6,066	2,515	320	2,819	61	67.8	28.1	3.6	31.5	0
San Jacinto (100%)			22,246	17,972	2,872	1,084	3,920	354	80.8	12.9	4.9	17.6	1
Trinity (100%)			13,779	11,289	1,673	668	2,328	162	81.9	12.1	4.8	16.9	1
Tyler (100%)			20,871	17,290	2,544	742	3,280	301	82.8	12.2	3.6	15.7	1
Walker (100%)			61,758	37,090	14,979	8,712	23,579	1,089	60.1	24.3	14.1	38.2	1
DIST 3	1 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,620 462,351	453,550 332,260	46,204 29,467	93,510 59,494	138,680 88,475	59,390 41,616	69.6 71.9	7.1	14.4	21.3	1
Collin (88%)			432,045	323,326	23,658	44,899	67,957	40,762	74.8	5.5	10.4	15.7	
Dallas (10%)			219,575	130,224	22,546	48,611	70,723	18,628	59.3	10.3	22.1	32.2	
DIST 4	1 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,620 477,444	499,005 378,430	78,673 53,285	61,350 36,605	139,263 89,513	13,352 9,501	76.6 79.3	12.1	9.4	21.4	
Collin (5%)			25,074	21,025	756	2,786	3,514	535	83.9	3.0	11.1	14.0	
Cooke (100%)			36,363	30,826	1,200	3,627	4,792	745	84.8	3.3	10.0	13.2	
Fannin (100%)			31,242	26,298	2,559	1,753	4,297	647	84.2	8.2	5.6	13.8	
Grayson (100%)			110,595	92,857	6,977	7,519	14,364	3,374	84.0	6.3	6.8	13.0	
Gregg (100%)			111,379	76,851	22,575	10,183	32,584	1,944	69.0	20.3	9.1	29.3	
Hunt (2%)			1,702	1,585	16	76	92	25	93.1	0.9	4.5	5.4	
Kaufman (84%)			60,200	44,346	7,412	7,408	14,756	1,098	73.7	12.3	12.3	24.5	
Rains (100%)			9,139	8,183	281	505	781	175	89.5	3.1	5.5	8.5	

RED-M100
Data: 2000 Census
PLAN 0115IC 11/13/01 10:56:42

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBDIVISIONS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 3 of 78

		2000 CENSUS POPULATION											
			TOTAL	ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER	%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O
	DEVIAITON												
Rockwall (100%)			43,080	35,817	1,471	4,771	6,210	1,053	83.1	3.4	11.1	14.4	2.4
Smith (100%)			174,706	118,598	33,921	19,521	53,203	2,905	67.9	19.4	11.2	30.5	1.7
Van Zandt (100%)			48,140	42,619	1,505	3,201	4,670	851	88.5	3.1	6.6	9.7	1.8
DIST 5	1 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,620 476,050	410,691 318,238	106,847 71,097	115,328 73,043	220,682 143,432	20,247 14,380	63.0	16.4	17.7	33.9	3.1
Anderson (100%)			55,109	34,762	13,091	6,705	19,731	616	63.1	23.8	12.2	35.8	1.1
Dallas (18%)			407,727	234,717	66,852	90,065	155,766	17,244	57.6	16.4	22.1	38.2	4.2
Falls (100%)			18,576	10,364	5,146	2,941	8,037	175	55.8	27.7	15.8	43.3	0.9
Freestone (100%)			17,867	12,823	3,418	1,465	4,862	182	71.8	19.1	8.2	27.2	1.0
Henderson (100%)			73,277	62,124	5,003	5,071	10,017	1,136	84.8	6.8	6.9	13.7	1.6
Kaufman (16%)			11,113	10,078	352	517	868	167	90.7	3.2	4.7	7.8	1.5
Leon (100%)			15,335	12,366	1,618	1,213	2,817	152	80.6	10.6	7.9	18.4	1.0
Limestone (100%)			22,051	14,711	4,303	2,859	7,126	214	66.7	19.5	13.0	32.3	1.0
McLennan (1%)			1,625	1,365	155	91	243	17	84.0	9.5	5.6	15.0	1.0
Madison (100%)			12,940	7,801	2,997	2,042	4,990	149	60.3	23.2	15.8	38.6	1.2
Robertson (100%)			16,000	9,580	3,914	2,359	6,225	195	59.9	24.5	14.7	38.9	1.2
DIST 6	1 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,620 460,653	467,753 344,008	70,416 44,746	88,166 54,052	157,184 98,165	26,683 18,480	71.8	10.8	13.5	24.1	4.1
Ellis (100%)			111,360	79,401	9,923	20,508	30,262	1,697	71.3	8.9	18.4	27.2	1.5
Hill (100%)			32,323	25,079	2,482	4,360	6,793	449	77.6	7.7	13.5	21.0	1.4
Johnson (100%)			126,811	105,460	3,487	15,375	18,685	2,666	83.2	2.7	12.1	14.7	2.1
Navarro (100%)			45,124	29,596	7,767	7,113	14,770	758	65.6	17.2	15.8	32.7	1.7
Tarrant (23%)			336,004	228,217	46,757	40,810	86,674	21,113	67.9	13.9	12.1	25.8	6.3
DIST 7	1 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,620 480,241	322,915 254,837	79,120 52,002	168,812 112,105	245,116 162,459	83,589 62,945	49.6	12.1	25.9	37.6	12.8
Harris (19%)			651,620	322,915	79,120	168,812	245,116	83,589	79.1	10.8	23.3	33.8	13.1
DIST 8	0 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,619 460,428	502,784 364,372	36,576 23,298	84,488 53,301	120,151 76,146	28,684 19,910	77.2	5.6	13.0	18.4	4.4
Harris (12%)			397,932	297,950	26,161	52,003	77,535	22,447	74.9	6.6	13.1	19.5	5.6
Montgomery (86%)			253,687	204,834	10,415	32,485	42,616	6,237	80.7	4.1	12.8	16.8	2.5
DIST 9	0 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,619 479,291	391,936 302,868	141,809 97,202	93,730 61,706	233,802 158,023	25,881 18,400	60.1	21.8	14.4	35.9	4.0
Chambers (100%)			26,031	20,210	2,616	2,810	5,397	424	63.2	20.3	12.9	33.0	3.8
Galveston (100%)			250,158	157,851	39,643	44,939	83,922	8,385	67.5	10.9	15.8	26.4	6.1
Harris (4%)			123,379	83,271	13,416	19,445	32,567	7,541	51.8	34.2	10.5	44.4	3.8
Jefferson (100%)			252,051	130,604	86,134	26,536	111,916	9,531	77.6	10.0	10.8	20.7	1.6
DIST 10	0 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,619 501,698	323,676 273,207	77,160 52,760	215,302 145,516	289,324 196,701	38,619 31,790	54.5	10.5	29.0	39.2	6.2
Travis (80%)			651,619	323,676	77,160	215,302	289,324	38,619	49.7	11.8	33.0	44.4	5.1
DIST 11	1 (0.00%)	Total: VAP:	651,620 473,740	418,078 321,991	108,525 70,976	106,980 66,660	212,027 136,010	21,515 15,739	64.2	16.7	16.4	32.5	3.
Bell (100%)			237,974	136,241	52,225	39,701	89,793	11,940	57.3	21.9	16.7	37.7	5.
Bosque (100%)			17,204	14,507	369	2,104	2,457	240	84.3	2.1	12.2	14.3	1.
Coryell (100%)			74,978	45,381	17,363	9,424	26,240	3,357	60.5	23.2	12.6	35.0	4.
Hamilton (100%)			8,229	7,498	20	610	629	102	91.1	0.2	7.4	7.6	1.
Lampasas (100%)			17,762	14,121	613	2,677	3,235	406	79.5	3.5	15.1	18.2	2
McLennan (99%)			211,892	136,643	33,254	38,142	70,832	4,417	64.5	15.7	18.0	33.4	2
Milam (100%)			24,238	16,763	2,747	4,516	7,196	279	69.2	11.3	18.6	29.7	1
Mills (100%)			5,151	4,367	71	671	738	46	84.8	1.4	13.0	14.3	0
San Saba (100%)			6,186	4,622	172	1,333	1,496	68	74.7	2.8	21.5	24.2	1
Williamson (19%)			48,006	37,935	1,691	7,802	9,411	660	79.0	3.5	16.3	19.6	1

RED-M100
Data: 2000 Census
PLAN 0115IC 11/13/01 10:56:42

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBTYPE LS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 4 of 8

	DEVIATION	2000 CENSUS POPULATION							%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O
		TOTAL	ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER						
DIST 12	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 474,206	465,214 353,385	32,107 21,770	129,390 81,179	160,469 102,473	25,936 18,348	71.4 74.5	4.9 4.6	19.9 17.1	24.6 21.6	4.8 3.9	
Parker (100%)		88,495	78,980	1,718	6,211	7,883	1,632	89.2	1.9	7.0	8.9	1.8	
Tarrant (39%)		563,124	386,234	30,389	123,179	152,586	24,304	68.6	5.4	21.9	27.1	4.3	
DIST 13	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 474,614	455,885 350,947	39,691 27,087	140,478 84,892	178,720 111,439	17,014 12,228	70.0 73.9	6.1 5.7	21.6 17.9	27.4 23.5	2.6 2.6	
Archer (100%)		8,854	8,263	17	431	446	145	93.3	0.2	4.9	5.0	1.6	
Armstrong (100%)		2,148	2,008	7	116	121	19	93.5	0.3	5.4	5.6	0.9	
Baylor (100%)		4,093	3,511	142	382	522	60	85.8	3.5	9.3	12.8	1.5	
Briscoe (100%)		1,790	1,319	48	407	450	21	73.7	2.7	22.7	25.1	1.2	
Carson (100%)		6,516	5,904	53	458	511	101	90.6	0.8	7.0	7.8	1.6	
Castro (100%)		8,285	3,765	212	4,279	4,476	44	45.4	2.6	51.6	54.0	0.5	
Childress (100%)		7,688	4,923	1,116	1,574	2,677	88	64.0	14.5	20.5	34.8	1.1	
Clay (100%)		11,006	10,317	50	404	451	238	93.7	0.5	3.7	4.1	2.2	
Collingsworth (100%)		3,206	2,289	176	655	826	91	71.4	5.5	20.4	25.8	2.8	
Cottle (100%)		1,904	1,348	199	360	544	12	70.8	10.5	18.9	28.6	0.6	
Crosby (100%)		7,072	3,301	291	3,460	3,731	40	46.7	4.1	48.9	52.8	0.6	
Dallam (100%)		6,222	4,257	118	1,766	1,875	90	68.4	1.9	28.4	30.1	1.4	
Deaf Smith (100%)		18,561	7,491	314	10,654	10,915	155	40.4	1.7	57.4	58.8	0.8	
Dickens (100%)		2,762	1,857	231	660	883	22	67.2	8.4	23.9	32.0	0.8	
Donley (100%)		3,828	3,372	169	243	410	46	88.1	4.4	6.3	10.7	1.2	
Floyd (100%)		7,771	3,875	277	3,569	3,829	67	49.9	3.6	45.9	49.3	0.9	
Foard (100%)		1,622	1,277	56	265	320	25	78.7	3.5	16.3	19.7	1.5	
Garza (7%)		343	217	20	89	109	17	63.3	5.8	25.9	31.8	5.0	
Gray (100%)		22,744	17,800	1,419	2,959	4,343	601	78.3	6.2	13.0	19.1	2.6	
Hale (100%)		36,602	16,526	2,226	17,532	19,649	427	45.2	6.1	47.9	53.7	1.2	
Hall (100%)		3,782	2,397	321	1,040	1,347	38	63.4	8.5	27.5	35.6	1.0	
Hansford (100%)		5,369	3,604	17	1,690	1,700	65	67.1	0.3	31.5	31.7	1.2	
Hardeman (100%)		4,724	3,731	237	685	920	73	79.0	5.0	14.5	19.5	1.5	
Hartley (100%)		5,537	4,270	457	758	1,209	58	77.1	8.3	13.7	21.8	1.0	
Hemphill (100%)		3,351	2,722	53	522	575	54	81.2	1.6	15.6	17.2	1.6	
Hutchinson (100%)		23,857	19,104	620	3,506	4,099	654	80.1	2.6	14.7	17.2	2.7	
King (100%)		356	315	0	34	34	7	88.5	0.0	9.6	9.6	2.0	
Knox (100%)		4,253	2,829	312	1,067	1,375	49	66.5	7.3	25.1	32.3	1.2	
Lamb (4%)		528	381	9	134	143	4	72.2	1.7	25.4	27.1	0.8	
LipscOMB (100%)		3,057	2,344	19	633	647	66	76.7	0.6	20.7	21.2	2.2	
Montague (100%)		19,117	17,717	49	1,035	1,070	330	92.7	0.3	5.4	5.6	1.7	
Moore (100%)		20,121	10,038	155	9,558	9,655	428	49.9	0.8	47.5	48.0	2.1	
Motley (100%)		1,426	1,172	60	173	230	24	82.2	4.2	12.1	16.1	1.7	
Ochiltree (100%)		9,006	5,972	16	2,863	2,873	161	66.3	0.2	31.8	31.9	1.1	
Oldham (100%)		2,185	1,852	49	241	290	43	84.8	2.2	11.0	13.3	2.0	
Potter (100%)		113,546	65,470	11,994	31,921	43,485	4,591	57.7	10.6	28.1	38.3	4.1	
Randall (100%)		104,312	89,426	1780	10,718	12,400	2,486	85.7	1.7	10.3	11.9	2.2	
Roberts (100%)		887	850	3	28	31	6	95.8	0.3	3.2	3.5	0.	
Sherman (100%)		3,186	2,263	19	874	890	33	71.0	0.6	27.4	27.9	1	
Swisher (100%)		8,378	4,849	507	2,951	3,446	83	57.9	6.1	35.2	41.1	1	
Wheeler (100%)		5,284	4,386	152	664	806	92	83.0	2.9	12.6	15.3	1	
Wichita (100%)		131,664	96,490	14,370	16,097	30,069	5,105	73.3	10.9	12.2	22.8	3	
Wilbarger (100%)		14,676	10,083	1,351	3,015	4,338	255	68.7	9.2	20.5	29.6	1	
DIST 14	1 (0.00%)	Total: 651,620 VAP: 473,524	379,022 294,421	53,766 37,121	208,796 134,313	260,520 170,546	12,078 8,557	58.2 62.2	8.3 7.8	32.0 28.4	40.0 36.0	1 1	
Aranas (100%)		22,497	16,596	373	4,571	4,915	986	73.8	1.7	20.3	21.8	4	
Bastrop (56%)		32,382	21,924	3,179	6,795	9,872	586	67.7	9.8	21.0	30.5	1	
Brazoria (27%)		64,248	38,120	7,722	17,568	25,088	1,040	59.3	12.0	27.3	39.0	1	
Caldwell (100%)		32,194	15,929	2,877	13,018	15,787	478	49.5	8.9	40.4	49.0	1	
Calhoun (100%)		20,647	10,774	596	8,448	9,000	873	52.2	2.9	40.9	43.6	1	

RED-M100
Data: 2000 Census
PLAN 0115IC 11/13/01 10:56:42

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBTOTALS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 5 of 8

DEVIATION	TOTAL	2000 CENSUS POPULATION					%A %B %H %BH %O				
		ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER					
Colorado (100%)	20,390	13,165	1,075	4,024	7,033	192	64.6	15.1	19.7	34.5	0.9
De Witt (100%)	20,013	12,168	2,265	5,452	7,647	198	60.8	11.3	27.2	38.2	1.0
Fayette (100%)	21,804	17,271	1,562	2,786	4,312	221	79.2	7.2	12.8	19.8	1.0
Gonzales (100%)	18,628	9,539	1,641	7,381	8,920	169	51.2	8.8	39.6	47.9	0.9
Guadalupe (100%)	89,023	52,858	4,825	29,561	34,142	2,023	59.4	5.4	33.2	38.4	2.3
Hays (59%)	57,278	29,591	3,522	23,065	26,354	1,333	51.7	6.1	40.3	46.0	2.3
Jackson (100%)	14,391	9,546	1,160	3,551	4,660	185	66.3	8.1	24.7	32.4	1.3
Karnes (100%)	15,446	6,309	1,717	7,324	8,953	184	40.8	11.1	47.4	58.0	1.2
Lavaca (100%)	19,210	15,579	1,357	2,183	3,502	129	81.1	7.1	11.4	18.2	0.7
Matagorda (100%)	37,957	19,900	4,997	11,898	16,782	1,275	52.4	13.2	31.3	44.2	3.4
Refugio (100%)	7,828	3,703	545	3,490	4,024	101	47.3	7.0	44.6	51.4	1.3
Victoria (100%)	84,088	44,490	5,609	32,959	38,287	1,311	52.9	6.7	39.2	45.5	1.6
Wharton (100%)	41,188	21,832	6,298	12,888	19,004	352	53.0	15.3	31.3	46.1	0.9
Wilson (100%)	32,408	19,728	454	11,834	12,238	442	60.9	1.4	36.5	37.8	1.4
DIST 15 0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619	125,325	10,555	509,898	518,852	7,442	19.2	1.6	78.3	79.6	1.1
	VAP: 437,760	100,048	8,019	325,182	332,393	5,319	22.9	1.8	74.3	75.9	1.2
Bee (100%)	32,359	11,352	3,263	17,450	20,622	385	35.1	10.1	53.9	63.7	1.2
Brooks (100%)	7,976	633	24	7,304	7,309	34	7.9	0.3	91.6	91.6	0.4
Goliad (100%)	6,928	4,115	349	2,439	2,764	49	59.4	5.0	35.2	39.9	0.7
Hidalgo (84%)	475,611	53,289	3,065	415,755	417,749	4,573	11.2	0.6	87.4	87.8	1.0
Kleberg (89%)	28,163	7,357	1,216	19,004	20,102	704	26.1	4.3	67.5	71.4	2.5
Live Oak (100%)	12,309	7,199	306	4,683	4,966	144	58.5	2.5	38.0	40.3	1.2
Nueces (7%)	21,135	10,631	176	10,082	10,219	285	50.3	0.8	47.7	48.4	1.3
San Patricio (100%)	67,138	30,749	2,156	33,181	35,121	1,268	45.8	3.2	49.4	52.3	1.9
DIST 16 0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619	113,278	23,298	506,142	526,127	12,214	17.4	3.6	77.7	80.7	1.9
	VAP: 445,599	89,726	15,119	333,226	346,878	8,995	20.1	3.4	74.8	77.8	2.0
El Paso (96%)	651,619	113,278	23,298	506,142	526,127	12,214	17.4	3.6	77.7	80.7	1.9
DIST 17 0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619	486,461	27,476	127,509	153,722	11,436	74.7	4.2	19.6	23.6	1.8
	VAP: 484,661	377,157	19,253	88,468	99,230	8,274	77.8	4.0	16.6	20.5	1.7
Borden (100%)	729	624	1	87	88	17	85.6	0.1	11.9	12.1	2.3
Brown (100%)	37,674	29,772	1,606	5,793	7,356	546	79.0	4.3	15.4	19.5	1.4
Callahan (100%)	12,905	11,822	48	812	856	227	91.6	0.4	6.3	6.6	1.8
Coke (100%)	3,864	3,079	79	653	731	54	79.7	2.0	16.9	18.9	1.4
Coleman (100%)	9,235	7,599	225	1,289	1,507	129	82.3	2.4	14.0	16.3	1.4
Comanche (100%)	14,026	10,846	83	2,928	2,997	183	77.3	0.6	20.9	21.4	1.3
Concho (100%)	3,966	2,265	43	1,639	1,679	22	57.1	1.1	41.3	42.3	0.6
Dawson (100%)	14,985	6,349	1,325	7,222	8,524	112	42.4	8.8	48.2	56.9	0.7
Eastland (100%)	18,297	15,686	429	1,976	2,397	214	85.7	2.3	10.8	13.1	1.2
Erath (100%)	33,001	27,269	318	4,959	5,256	476	82.6	1.0	15.0	15.9	1.4
Fisher (100%)	4,344	3,250	128	928	1,046	48	74.8	2.9	21.4	24.1	1.1
Garza (93%)	4,529	2,543	242	1,721	1,946	40	56.1	5.3	38.0	43.0	0.9
Glasscock (100%)	1,406	955	8	420	427	24	67.9	0.6	29.9	30.4	1.7
Haskell (100%)	6,093	4,600	191	1,249	1,423	70	75.5	3.1	20.5	23.4	1.1
Hood (100%)	41,100	37,193	193	2,975	3,137	770	90.5	0.5	7.2	7.6	1.9
Irion (100%)	1,771	1,321	7	436	440	10	74.6	0.4	24.6	24.8	0.6
Jack (10%)	8,763	7,468	488	691	1,173	122	85.2	5.6	7.9	13.4	1.4
Jones (100%)	20,785	13,752	2,430	4,346	6,745	288	66.2	11.7	20.9	32.5	1.4
Kent (100%)	859	777	2	78	80	2	90.5	0.2	9.1	9.3	0.2
McCulloch (100%)	8,205	5,792	141	2,219	2,344	69	70.6	1.7	27.0	28.6	0.8
Mitchell (100%)	9,698	5,341	1,260	3,009	4,252	105	55.1	13.0	31.0	43.8	1.1
Nolan (100%)	15,802	10,480	811	4,431	5,200	122	66.3	5.1	28.0	32.9	0.8
Palo Pinto (100%)	27,826	22,163	709	3,667	4,348	515	82.0	2.6	13.6	16.1	1.9
Runnels (100%)	11,495	7,793	193	3,372	3,556	146	67.8	1.7	29.3	30.9	1.3
Schleicher (100%)	2,935	1,595	54	1,278	1,315	25	54.3	1.8	43.5	44.8	0.9
Scurry (100%)	16,361	10,672	1,030	4,544	5,549	140	65.2	6.3	27.8	33.9	0.9

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBTOTALS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

DEVIATION	TOTAL	2000 CENSUS POPULATION					%A %B %H %BH %O				
		ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER					
Shackelford (100%)	3,302	3,014	19	251	262	26	91.3	0.6	7.6	7.9	0.8
Somervell (100%)	6,809	5,763	30	915	938	108	84.6	0.4	13.4	13.8	1.6
Stephens (100%)	9,674	7,861	300	1,418	1,713	100	81.3	3.1	14.7	17.7	1.0
Sterling (100%)	1,393	955	1	432	433	5	68.6	0.1	31.0	31.1	0.4
Stonewall (100%)	1,693	1,412	60	199	256	25	83.4	3.5	31.8	15.1	1.5
Taylor (100%)	126,555	91,999	9,326	22,328	31,187	3,369	72.7	7.4	17.6	24.6	2.7
Throckmorton (100%)	1,850	1,655	1	173	174	21	89.5	0.1	9.4	9.4	1.1
Tom Green (100%)	104,010	65,508	4,757	31,946	36,363	2,139	63.0	4.6	30.7	35.0	2.1
Wise (99%)	48,536	41,769	692	5,219	5,877	890	86.1	1.4	10.8	12.1	1.8
Young (100%)	17,943	15,519	246	1,906	2,147	277	86.5	1.4	10.6	12.0	1.5
DIST 18 1 (0.00%)	Total: 651,620 VAP: 474,150	138,241	280,419	212,439	489,675	23,704	21.2	43.0	32.6	75.1	3.6
Harris (19%)	651,620	138,241	280,419	212,439	489,675	23,704	21.2	43.0	32.6	75.1	3.6
DIST 19 0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 466,505	379,373	39,909	222,308	260,410	11,836	58.2	6.1	34.1	40.0	1.8
Andrews (100%)	13,004	7,322	244	5,202	5,413	269	56.3	1.9	40.0	41.6	2.1
Bailey (100%)	6,594	3,317	96	3,119	3,204	73	50.3	1.5	47.3	48.6	1.1
Cochran (100%)	3,730	1,864	192	1,646	1,829	37	50.0	5.1	44.1	49.0	1.0
Crane (100%)	3,996	2,083	126	1,753	1,872	41	52.1	3.2	43.9	46.8	1.0
Ector (100%)	121,123	62,168	5,972	51,306	56,915	2,040	51.3	4.9	42.4	47.0	1.7
Gaines (100%)	14,467	8,803	346	5,175	5,492	172	60.8	2.4	35.8	38.0	1.2
Hockley (100%)	22,716	13,155	903	8,459	9,326	235	57.9	4.0	37.2	41.1	1.0
Howard (100%)	33,627	19,096	1,489	12,597	13,958	573	56.8	4.4	37.5	41.5	1.7
Lamb (96%)	14,181	7,172	675	6,259	6,895	114	50.6	4.8	44.1	48.6	0.8
Loving (100%)	67	60	0	7	7	0	89.6	0.0	10.4	10.4	0.0
Lubbock (100%)	242,628	151,705	19,513	66,609	85,394	5,529	62.5	8.0	27.5	35.2	2.3
Lynn (100%)	6,550	3,377	201	2,923	3,101	72	51.6	3.1	44.6	47.3	1.1
Martin (100%)	4,746	2,696	92	1,925	2,007	43	56.8	1.9	40.6	42.3	0.9
Midland (100%)	116,009	72,015	8,476	33,676	41,884	2,110	62.1	7.3	29.0	36.1	1.8
Parmer (100%)	10,016	4,876	122	4,927	5,028	112	48.7	1.2	49.2	50.2	1.1
Terry (100%)	12,761	6,351	680	5,626	6,267	143	49.8	5.3	44.1	49.1	1.1
Ward (100%)	10,909	5,695	530	4,580	5,071	143	52.2	4.9	42.0	46.5	1.3
Winkler (100%)	7,173	3,825	146	3,156	3,292	56	53.3	2.0	44.0	45.9	0.8
Yoskum (100%)	7,322	3,793	106	3,363	3,455	74	51.8	1.4	45.9	47.2	1.0
DIST 20 0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 464,185	154,546	40,474	444,249	481,103	15,970	23.7	6.2	68.2	73.8	2.5
Bexar (47%)	651,619	154,546	40,474	444,249	481,103	15,970	23.7	6.2	68.2	73.8	2.5
DIST 21 0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 489,096	502,974	15,828	131,928	126,749	21,896	77.2	2.4	17.2	19.5	3.4
Bandera (100%)	17,645	14,833	81	2,384	2,449	363	84.1	0.5	13.5	13.9	2.1
Bexar (14%)	196,596	133,405	9,870	46,819	56,125	7,066	67.9	5.0	23.8	28.5	3.6
Blanco (100%)	8,418	6,912	74	1,290	1,361	145	82.1	0.9	15.3	16.2	1.7
Burnet (100%)	34,147	28,017	594	5,044	5,604	526	82.0	1.7	14.8	16.4	1.5
Comal (100%)	78,021	58,345	909	17,609	18,413	1,263	74.8	1.2	22.6	23.6	1.6
Gillespie (100%)	20,814	17,232	64	3,309	3,348	234	82.8	0.3	15.9	16.1	1.1
Hays (41%)	40,311	33,354	425	5,794	6,187	770	82.7	1.1	14.4	15.3	1.9
Kendall (100%)	23,743	19,104	113	4,248	4,331	308	80.5	0.5	17.9	18.2	1.2
Kerr (100%)	43,653	33,802	850	8,353	9,138	713	77.4	1.9	19.1	20.9	1.6
Kimble (100%)	4,468	3,481	10	926	930	57	77.9	0.2	20.7	20.8	1.1
Llano (100%)	17,044	15,869	65	875	937	238	93.1	0.4	5.1	5.5	1.4
Mason (100%)	3,738	2,912	7	783	789	37	77.9	0.2	20.9	21.1	1.1
Menard (100%)	2,360	1,567	17	748	758	35	66.4	0.7	31.7	32.1	1.1
Travis (20%)	160,661	134,141	2,749	13,746	16,379	10,141	83.5	1.7	8.6	10.2	6.1

POPULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBTOTALS
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 011Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 7 of 8

		2000 CENSUS POPULATION											
DEVIATION		TOTAL	ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER		%A	%B	%H	%BH	%O
DIST 22	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 455,222	391,798 283,881	69,310 46,452	128,339 81,856	196,210 127,631	63,611 43,710		60.1 62.4	10.6 10.2	19.7 18.0	30.1 28.0	9.8 9.6
Brazoria (73%)		177,519	119,932	13,652	37,495	50,803	6,784		67.6	7.7	21.1	28.6	3.8
Fort Bend (91%)		321,994	162,657	48,496	67,361	115,005	44,332		50.5	15.1	20.9	35.7	13.8
Harris (4%)		152,106	109,209	7,162	23,483	30,402	12,495		71.8	4.7	15.4	20.0	8.2
DIST 23	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 441,598	194,385 147,662	11,446 7,756	435,056 278,240	444,729 285,117	12,505 8,819		29.8 33.4	1.8 1.8	66.8 63.0	68.2 64.6	1.9 2.0
Bexar (12%)		172,051	118,498	6,501	47,726	53,813	7,740		64.2	3.8	27.7	31.3	4.5
Brewster (100%)		8,866	4,710	138	3,867	3,967	189		53.1	1.6	43.6	44.7	2.1
Crockett (100%)		4,099	1,792	36	2,242	2,266	41		43.7	0.9	54.7	55.3	1.0
Culberson (100%)		2,975	733	22	2,149	2,168	74		24.6	0.7	72.2	72.9	2.5
Dimmit (100%)		10,248	1,350	114	8,708	8,784	114		13.2	1.1	85.0	85.7	1.1
Edwards (100%)		2,162	1,161	30	974	977	24		53.7	1.4	45.1	45.2	1.1
El Paso (4%)		28,003	2,257	184	25,512	25,612	134		8.1	0.7	91.1	91.5	0.5
Hudspeth (100%)		3,344	770	12	2,509	2,516	58		23.0	0.4	75.0	75.2	1.7
Jeff Davis (100%)		2,207	1,376	26	783	801	30		62.3	1.2	35.5	36.3	1.4
Kinney (100%)		3,379	1,587	67	1,707	1,754	38		47.0	2.0	50.5	51.9	1.1
Maverick (100%)		47,297	1,610	193	44,938	44,997	690		3.4	0.4	95.0	95.1	1.5
Medina (100%)		39,304	19,919	947	17,873	18,723	662		50.7	2.4	45.5	47.6	1.7
Pecos (100%)		16,809	5,607	756	10,262	10,969	233		33.4	4.5	61.1	65.3	1.4
Presidio (100%)		7,304	1,079	27	6,162	6,177	48		14.8	0.4	84.4	84.6	0.7
Reagan (100%)		3,326	1,545	114	1,646	1,748	33		46.5	3.4	49.5	52.6	1.0
Real (100%)		3,047	2,306	10	688	695	46		75.7	0.3	22.6	22.8	1.5
Reeves (100%)		13,137	3,131	295	9,640	9,893	113		23.8	2.2	73.4	75.3	0.9
Sutton (100%)		4,077	1,934	16	2,106	2,118	25		47.4	0.4	51.7	51.9	0.6
Terrell (100%)		1,081	529	0	525	525	27		48.9	0.0	48.6	48.6	2.5
Upton (100%)		3,404	1,854	62	1,449	1,504	46		54.5	1.8	42.6	44.2	1.4
Uvalde (100%)		25,926	8,471	140	17,089	17,182	273		32.7	0.5	65.9	66.3	1.1
Val Verde (100%)		44,856	9,734	779	33,849	34,511	611		21.7	1.7	75.5	76.9	1.4
Webb (100%)		193,117	9,508	913	182,070	182,401	1,208		4.9	0.5	94.3	94.5	0.6
Zavala (100%)		11,600	924	64	10,582	10,628	48		8.0	0.6	91.2	91.6	0.4
DIST 24	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 456,633	230,166 186,027	147,620 97,576	247,533 153,224	392,418 249,476	29,035 21,130		35.3	22.7	38.0	60.2	4.5
Dallas (13%)		288,358	97,759	39,677	142,405	180,978	9,621		33.9	13.8	49.4	62.8	3.3
Tarrant (25%)		363,261	132,407	107,943	105,128	211,440	19,414		36.4	29.7	28.9	58.2	5.3
DIST 25	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 464,555	238,630 191,555	154,123 102,175	223,254 142,828	373,920 243,076	39,069 29,924		36.6	23.7	34.3	57.4	6.0
Fort Bend (9%)		32,458	1,131	23,671	7,510	30,892	435		3.5	72.9	23.1	95.2	1.3
Harris (18%)		619,161	237,499	130,450	215,744	343,028	38,634		38.4	21.1	34.8	55.4	6.2
DIST 26	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 469,677	507,231 372,252	35,669 23,989	71,646 47,067	106,364 70,582	38,024 26,843		77.8	5.5	11.0	16.3	5.8
Collin (7%)		34,556	29,765	952	2,825	3,752	1,039		86.1	2.8	8.2	10.9	3.1
Denton (100%)		432,976	328,849	27,214	52,619	79,132	24,995		76.0	6.3	12.2	18.3	5.1
Tarrant (13%)		183,830	148,395	7,500	16,173	23,448	11,987		80.7	4.1	8.8	12.8	6.1
Wise (1%)		257	222	3	29	32	3		86.4	1.2	11.3	12.5	1.1
DIST 27	0 (0.00%)	Total: 651,619 VAP: 448,341	160,300 128,780	16,840 10,948	466,772 302,436	481,491 312,416	9,828 7,145		24.6	2.6	71.6	73.9	1.
Cameron (100%)		335,227	48,679	2,030	282,736	283,758	2,790		14.5	0.6	84.3	84.6	0.
Kenedy (100%)		414	84	3	327	327	3		20.3	0.7	79.0	79.0	0.
Kleberg (11%)		3,386	1,640	44	1,631	1,672	74		48.4	1.3	48.2	49.4	2.
Nueces (93%)		292,510	107,547	14,296	164,869	178,115	6,848		36.8	4.9	56.4	60.9	2
Willacy (100%)		20,082	2,350	467	17,209	17,619	113		11.7	2.3	85.7	87.7	0

RED-M100
Data: 2000 Census
PLAN 0115TC 11/13/01 10:56:42

ULATION ANALYSIS WITH COUNTY SUBTO S
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:13 AM
Page 8 of 8

DEVIATION		Total:	VAP:	2000 CENSUS POPULATION						%A %B %H %BH %O				
				TOTAL	ANGLO	BLACK	HISP	B+H	OTHER					
DIST 28	1 (0.00%)	651,620	138,008	53,142	453,671	503,967	9,645	21.2	8.2	69.6	77.3	1.5		
		Total:	439,963	109,142	35,980	289,140	323,792	7,029	24.8	8.2	65.7	73.6	1.6	
Atascosa (100%)		38,628	15,284	286	22,620	22,828	516	39.6	0.7	58.6	59.1	1.3		
Bexar (27%)		372,665	97,796	51,008	218,239	266,950	7,919	26.2	13.7	58.6	71.6	2.1		
Duval (100%)		13,120	1,452	81	11,544	11,603	65	11.1	0.6	88.0	88.4	0.5		
Frio (100%)		16,252	3,344	815	11,987	12,766	142	20.6	5.0	73.8	78.6	0.9		
Hidalgo (16%)		93,852	6,134	262	87,345	87,436	282	6.5	0.3	93.1	93.2	0.3		
Jim Hogg (100%)		5,281	474	28	4,752	4,777	30	9.0	0.5	90.0	90.5	0.6		
Jim Wells (100%)		39,326	9,001	280	29,772	29,962	363	22.9	0.7	75.7	76.2	0.9		
La Salle (100%)		5,866	1,114	211	4,524	4,718	34	19.0	3.6	77.1	80.4	0.6		
McMullen (100%)		851	556	10	282	292	3	65.3	1.2	33.1	34.3	0.4		
Starr (100%)		53,597	1,082	102	52,278	52,285	230	2.0	0.2	97.5	97.6	0.4		
Zapata (100%)		12,182	1,771	59	10,328	10,350	61	14.5	0.5	84.8	85.0	0.5		
DIST 29	1 (0.00%)	651,620	130,126	100,004	405,267	502,335	19,159	20.0	15.3	62.2	77.1	2.9		
		Total:	435,066	105,290	64,065	253,158	315,710	14,066	24.2	14.7	58.2	72.6	3.2	
Harris (19%)		651,620	130,126	100,004	405,267	502,335	19,159	20.0	15.3	62.2	77.1	2.9		
DIST 30	1 (0.00%)	651,620	160,712	270,012	202,952	470,119	20,789	24.7	41.4	31.1	72.1	3.2		
		Total:	459,982	132,816	185,331	127,475	311,271	15,895	28.9	40.3	27.7	67.7	3.5	
Dallas (29%)		651,620	160,712	270,012	202,952	470,119	20,789	24.7	41.4	31.1	72.1	3.2		
DIST 31	1 (0.00%)	651,620	452,305	62,248	110,104	170,918	28,397	69.4	9.6	16.9	26.2	4.4		
		Total:	468,472	337,683	41,542	69,625	110,486	20,305	72.1	8.9	14.9	23.6	4.3	
Austin (100%)		23,590	16,964	2,614	3,805	6,362	264	71.9	11.1	16.1	27.0	1.1		
Bastrop (44%)		25,351	15,840	2,148	7,050	9,094	417	62.5	8.5	27.8	35.9	1.6		
Brazos (100%)		152,415	100,647	16,816	27,253	43,766	8,002	66.0	11.0	17.9	28.7	5.3		
Burleson (100%)		16,470	11,361	2,531	2,411	4,896	213	69.0	15.4	14.6	29.7	1.3		
Harris (5%)		153,140	113,053	8,558	22,558	30,873	9,214	73.8	5.6	14.7	20.2	6.0		
Lee (100%)		15,657	10,724	1,941	2,848	4,759	174	68.5	12.4	18.2	30.4	1.1		
Waller (100%)		32,663	16,289	9,706	6,344	15,963	411	49.9	29.7	19.4	48.9	1.5		
Washington (100%)		30,373	21,515	5,776	2,647	8,335	523	70.8	19.0	8.7	27.4	1.1		
Williamson (81%)		201,961	145,912	12,158	35,188	46,870	9,179	72.2	6.0	17.4	23.2	4.1		
DIST 32	0 (0.00%)	651,619	359,905	63,522	178,696	240,421	51,293	55.2	9.7	27.4	36.9	7.		
		Total:	499,601	296,008	45,334	120,387	164,715	38,878	59.2	9.1	24.1	33.0	7.	
Dallas (29%)		651,619	359,905	63,522	178,696	240,421	51,293	55.2	9.7	27.4	36.9	7.		

RED-M140
Date: 2000 Census
PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42

SPLIT CITIES AND CDPs**
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 01151

CITY/CDP	COUNTY	DISTRICT	2000 CENSUS POPULATION	
			Split City/CDP Population in District %	Total
Abernathy	Hale	013	75.1	2,131
	Lubbock	019	24.9	708
	City Total			2,839
Ackerly	Dawson	017	66.5	163
	Martin	019	33.5	82
	City Total			245
Alamo Heights	Bexar	020	0.3	25
	Bexar	021	99.7	7,294
	City Total			7,319
Alba	Wood	001	100.0	430
	Rains	004	0.0	0
	City Total			430
Alvin	Brazoria	014	0.0	0
	Brazoria	022	100.0	21,413
	City Total			21,413
Anderson Mill CDP	Travis	021	1.7	156
	Williamson	031	98.3	8,797
	City Total			8,953
Angleton	Brazoria	014	5.3	952
	Brazoria	022	94.7	17,178
	City Total			18,130
Aransas Pass	Aransas	014	10.7	867
	San Patricio	015	88.5	7,201
	Nueces	027	0.9	70
	City Total			8,138
Arlington	Tarrant	006	57.5	191,470
	Tarrant	024	42.2	140,407
	Tarrant	026	0.3	1,092
	City Total			332,969
Atascocita CDP	Harris	008	51.0	18,234
	Harris	009	49.0	17,523
	City Total			35,757
Austin	Travis	010	84.5	554,906
	Travis	021	13.7	89,846
	Williamson	031	1.8	11,810
	City Total			656,562
Bailey's Prairie	Brazoria	014	44.4	308
	Brazoria	022	55.6	386
	City Total			694
Barrett CDP	Harris	009	0.9	27
	Harris	025	99.1	2,845
	City Total			2,872
Baytown	Chambers	009*	4.6	3,081
	Harris	009*	30.6	20,298
	Harris	025	64.8	43,051
	City Total			66,430
Bedford	Tarrant	012	11.5	5,433
	Tarrant	026	88.5	41,719
	City Total			47,152
Brier CDP	Parker	012*	11.2	601
	Tarrant	012*	56.5	3,025
	Wise	017	32.2	1,724
	City Total			5,350
Bruceville-Eddy	Falls	005	0.1	2
	McLennan	011	99.9	1,488
	City Total			1,490
Bullard	Cherokee	002	4.6	53
	Smith	004	95.4	1,097
	City Total			1,150

*City/CDP is in more than one county in this district.

**CDP = Census Designated Place

RED-M140
Data: 2000 Census
PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42

SPLIT CITIES AND CDPs
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115**

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:19 AM
Page 2 of 9

CITY/CDP	COUNTY	DISTRICT	2000 CENSUS POPULATION	
			Split City/CDP Population in District %	Total
Camp Swift CDP	Bastrop	014	13.0	614
	Bastrop	031	87.0	4,117
	City Total			4,731
Carrollton	Collin	003	0.0	0
	Denton	026	54.5	59,754
	Dallas	032	45.5	49,822
	City Total			109,576
Castle Hills	Bexar	020	18.1	762
	Bexar	021	81.9	3,440
	City Total			4,202
Cedar Hill	Ellis	006	0.2	49
	Dallas	024	61.3	19,665
	Dallas	030	38.6	12,379
	City Total			32,093
Cedar Park	Travis	021	2.1	541
	Williamson	031	97.9	25,508
	City Total			26,049
Cleburne	Collin	003	0.0	0
	Collin	004	99.7	1,855
	Collin	026	0.3	6
	City Total			1,861
Channelview CDP	Harris	025	31.1	9,234
	Harris	029	68.9	20,451
	City Total			29,685
Cibolo	Guadalupe	014	100.0	3,035
	Bexar	028	0.0	0
	City Total			3,035
Cinco Ranch CDP	Harris	007	2.5	276
	Fort Bend	022	78.0	8,738
	Harris	031	19.5	2,182
	City Total			11,196
Circle D-KC Estates CDP	Bastrop	014	61.0	1,227
	Bastrop	031	39.0	783
	City Total			2,010
Clarksville City	Upshur	001	0.0	0
	Gregg	004	100.0	806
	City Total			806
Clute	Brazoria	014	100.0	10,422
	Brazoria	022	0.0	2
	City Total			10,424
Conroe	Montgomery	002	0.0	0
	Montgomery	008	100.0	36,811
	City Total			36,811
Coppell	Denton	026	0.6	224
	Dallas	032	99.4	35,734
	City Total			35,958
Corpus Christi	Nueces	015*	2.4	6,773
	San Patricio	015*	0.0	4
	Kleberg	027*	0.0	0
	Nueces	027*	97.6	270,677
	City Total			277,454
Crandall	Kaufman	004	3.2	90
	Kaufman	005	96.8	2,684
	City Total			2,774
Cut and Shoot	Montgomery	002	98.1	1,136
	Montgomery	008	1.9	22
	City Total			1,158

*City/CDP is in more than one county in this district.

**CDP = Census Designated Place

RED-M140
Date: 2000 Census
PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42

SPLIT CITIES AND CDPS**
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:19 AM
Page 3 of 9

CITY/CDP	COUNTY	DISTRICT	2000 CENSUS POPULATION	
			Split City/CDP Population in District %	Total
Dallas	Collin	003*	3.8	45,155
	Dallas	003*	0.0	7
	Collin	004*	0.0	0
	Kaufman	004*	0.0	0
	Rockwall	004*	0.0	21
	Dallas	005	15.9	188,480
	Dallas	024	11.7	139,111
	Denton	026	1.9	22,273
	Dallas	030	32.5	386,837
	Dallas	032	34.2	406,696
City Total				1,188,580
Deer Park	Harris	022	99.9	28,493
	Harris	025	0.1	27
	City Total			28,520
Duncanville	Dallas	024	85.0	30,665
	Dallas	030	15.0	5,416
	City Total			36,081
Euston	Rusk	001	7.1	37
	Gregg	004	92.9	487
	City Total			524
Elgin	Travis	010	0.6	33
	Bastrop	031	99.4	5,667
	City Total			5,700
Euless	Tarrant	012	8.1	3,728
	Tarrant	024	0.5	244
	Tarrant	026	91.4	42,033
	City Total			46,005
Fair Oaks Ranch	Comal	021*	5.2	246
	Kendall	021*	13.8	650
	Bexar	023	80.9	3,799
	City Total			4,695
Ferris	Dallas	005	0.0	0
	Ellis	006	100.0	2,175
	City Total			2,175
Forest Hill	Tarrant	006	0.3	43
	Tarrant	024	99.7	12,906
	City Total			12,949
Fort Worth	Tarrant	006	12.1	64,649
	Tarrant	012	50.5	270,210
	Tarrant	024	36.0	192,305
	Denton	026*	0.0	44
	Tarrant	026*	1.4	7,486
	City Total			534,694
Freeport	Brazoria	014	98.5	12,517
	Brazoria	022	1.5	191
	City Total			12,708
Frisco	Collin	003	76.0	25,618
	Collin	026*	13.9	4,694
	Denton	026*	10.1	3,402
	City Total			33,714
Galena Park	Harris	018	0.0	0
	Harris	029	100.0	10,592
	City Total			10,592
Garland	Collin	003*	0.0	0
	Dallas	003*	67.7	146,118
	Rockwall	004	0.0	0
	Dallas	005	25.4	54,729
	Dallas	032	6.9	14,921
	City Total			215,768

*City/CDP is in more than one county in this district.

**CDP = Census Designated Place

RED-M140
Data: 2000 Census
PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42

SPLIT CITIES AND CDPs
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 011**

Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:19 AM
Page 4 of 9

CITY/CDP	COUNTY	DISTRICT	2000 CENSUS POPULATION	
			Split City/CDP Population in District %	Total
Georgetown	Williamson	011	84.7	24,005
	Williamson	031	15.3	4,334
	City Total			28,339
Gladewater	Upshur	001	40.4	2,454
	Gregg	004	59.6	3,624
	City Total			6,078
Glenn Heights	Ellis	006	22.2	1,606
	Dallas	030	77.8	5,618
	City Total			7,224
Goliad	Falls	005	79.4	336
	McLennan	011	20.6	87
	City Total			423
Grand Prairie	Ellis	006*	0.0	46
	Tarrant	006*	8.2	10,420
	Dallas	024*	74.1	94,436
	Tarrant	024*	13.5	17,201
	Dallas	030	4.2	5,324
	City Total			127,427
Grapevine	Denton	026*	0.0	2
	Tarrant	026*	100.0	42,057
	Dallas	030	0.0	0
	Dallas	032	0.0	0
	City Total			42,059
Haltom City	Tarrant	012	100.0	39,002
	Tarrant	024	0.0	16
	City Total			39,018
Haslet	Tarrant	012	100.0	1,134
	Denton	026	0.0	0
	City Total			1,134
Horizon City	El Paso	016	72.6	3,798
	El Paso	023	27.4	1,435
	City Total			5,233
Houston	Harris	007	23.0	449,641
	Harris	008*	3.1	59,600
	Montgomery	008*	0.0	458
	Harris	009	1.4	27,358
	Harris	018	29.5	577,190
	Fort Bend	022*	0.0	926
	Harris	022*	2.3	45,752
	Fort Bend	025*	1.7	32,458
	Harris	025*	21.5	420,910
	Harris	029	17.4	339,295
	Harris	031	0.0	43
	City Total			1,953,631
Humble	Harris	008	84.0	12,253
	Harris	029	16.0	2,326
	City Total			14,579
Hurst	Tarrant	012	86.4	31,336
	Tarrant	024	0.0	0
	Tarrant	026	13.6	4,937
	City Total			36,273
Hutchins	Dallas	005	0.0	0
	Dallas	030	100.0	2,805
	City Total			2,805
Ingleside	San Patricio	015	100.0	9,388
	Nueces	027	0.0	0
	City Total			9,388
Irving	Dallas	030	86.4	165,467
	Dallas	032	13.6	26,148
	City Total			191,615

*City/CDP is in more than one county in this district.

**CDP = Census Designated Place

RED-M140
Date: 2000 Census
PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42SPLIT CITIES AND CDPs**
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 0115Texas Legislative Council
11/13/01 11:19 AM
Page 5 of 9

CITY/CDP	COUNTY	DISTRICT	2000 CENSUS POPULATION	
			Split City/CDP Population in District %	Total
Jacinto City	Harris Harris City Total	018 029	0.0 100.0	0 10,302 10,302
Jersey Village	Harris Harris Harris Harris City Total	007 008 031	0.0 100.0 0.0	0 6,880 0 6,880
Jollyville CDP	Travis Williamson City Total	010 031	6.4 93.6	1,012 14,801 15,813
Josephine	Hunt Collin City Total	001 004	3.2 96.8	19 575 594
Katy	Fort Bend Harris Waller City Total	022 031* 031*	7.5 85.6 6.8	889 10,082 804 11,775
Keller	Tarrant Tarrant City Total	012 026	86.6 13.4	23,689 3,656 27,345
Kenedale	Tarrant Tarrant City Total	006 024	97.4 2.6	5,700 150 5,850
Kilgore	Rusk Gregg City Total	001 004	22.8 77.2	2,580 8,721 11,301
Kingsville	Kleberg Kleberg City Total	015 027	99.7 0.3	25,494 81 25,575
La Paloma-Lost Creek CDP	Nueces Nueces City Total	015 027	57.6 42.4	186 137 323
La Porte	Harris Harris City Total	022 025	76.1 23.9	24,275 7,605 31,880
Lake Jackson	Brazoria Brazoria City Total	014 022	0.0 100.0	26,384 26,386
Lancaster	Dallas Dallas City Total	005 030	0.2 99.8	40 25,854 25,894
Leander	Travis Williamson City Total	021 031	0.0 100.0	0 7,596 7,596
Leon Valley	Bexar Bexar City Total	020 023	99.9 0.1	9,227 12 9,239
Lewisville	Denton Dallas City Total	026 032	100.0 0.0	77,735 2 77,737
Liberty Hill	Williamson Williamson City Total	031 031	12.0 88.0	169 1,240 1,409
Live Oak	Bexar Bexar City Total	021 028	1.3 98.7	117 9,039 9,156

*City/CDP is in more than one county in this district.

**CDP = Census Designated Place

RSD-M340
 Date: 2000 Census
 PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42
 PLAN 01000C 02/09/01 15:43:47

PLAN OVERLAP ANALYSIS
CONGRESSIONAL and CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS
 PLAN 01151C Compared with PLAN 01000C

Texas Legislative Council
 1/13/01 11:22 AM
 Page 1 of 4

PLAN 01151C DISTRICT	PLAN 01000C	2000 CENSUS								2000 GENERAL ELECTION *					
		TOTAL POPULATION				VOTER REG		TURNOUT		STATEWIDES**					
		TOTAL	%A	%B	%H	%B+H	%O	TOTAL	%SPAN	TOTAL	TO/VR	%DEM	%REP		
1		651,619	74.7	16.6	7.4	23.8	1.5	348,830	1.8	225,116	64.5%	39.1	60.9		
	1	89.3%						581,742	74.9	16.5	7.1	23.5	1.5	312,400	1.7
	2	5.5%						36,067	60.5	27.0	11.6	38.5	1.0	19,249	1.8
	4	5.2%						33,810	85.3	5.8	7.2	12.9	1.8	17,181	3.5
2		651,619	75.6	14.2	8.8	22.9	1.6	358,687	3.0	216,263	60.3%	41.0	59.0		
	1	0.6%						3,974	88.1	6.2	4.7	10.7	1.2	2,224	1.5
	2	93.3%						608,234	74.8	15.1	8.7	23.6	1.5	336,825	2.9
	8	6.0%						39,411	85.9	1.1	11.4	12.5	1.6	19,638	4.9
3		651,620	69.6	7.1	14.4	21.3	9.1	319,243	5.4	221,605	69.4%	26.7	73.3		
	3	91.5%						596,129	69.5	7.0	13.9	20.8	9.7	295,056	5.3
	4	7.3%						47,448	71.7	7.5	18.6	26.0	2.2	20,995	7.3
	26	1.2%						8,043	67.4	8.3	20.8	28.9	3.8	3,192	6.6
4		651,620	76.6	12.1	9.4	21.4	2.0	349,908	2.7	229,254	65.5%	31.5	68.5		
	1	5.6%						36,759	56.6	30.4	11.3	41.6	1.8	20,633	2.6
	4	87.8%						572,098	81.6	8.4	7.9	16.2	2.1	313,128	2.5
	5	6.5%						42,370	25.5	45.4	28.5	73.6	1.0	15,890	5.4
	13	0.1%						393	89.8	0.0	8.1	8.1	2.0	257	1.2
5		651,620	63.0	16.4	17.7	33.9	3.1	310,790	6.5	196,198	63.1%	39.2	60.8		
	3	17.9%						116,943	64.6	15.9	13.9	29.5	5.9	55,816	7.6
	4	1.0%						6,506	71.2	13.6	11.1	24.3	4.5	2,624	4.7
	5	73.4%						478,163	65.3	15.6	16.7	32.1	2.5	234,533	5.9
	11	3.1%						20,201	58.1	26.2	15.0	41.0	1.0	10,292	6.8
	24	0.7%						4,475	37.6	22.4	39.4	61.2	1.2	1,535	20.6
	26	2.2%						14,576	13.7	25.4	58.5	83.3	3.0	2,624	15.4
	30	1.7%						10,756	26.0	24.8	47.9	72.5	1.5	3,366	19.5
6		651,620	71.8	10.8	13.5	24.1	4.1	333,585	6.6	224,948	67.4%	33.8	66.2		
	6	44.9%						292,692	76.3	9.1	9.6	18.6	5.1	160,823	5.6
	11	5.0%						32,321	77.6	7.7	13.5	21.0	1.4	18,239	4.7
	12	23.0%						149,869	73.2	10.5	13.7	23.9	2.9	73,377	6.9
	24	27.1%						176,738	62.0	14.5	19.9	34.1	3.9	81,146	8.5
7		651,620	49.6	12.1	25.9	37.6	12.8	288,495	10.1	200,934	69.7%	31.3	68.7		
	7	74.9%						488,215	58.3	8.9	23.1	31.6	10.1	235,271	9.1
	22	18.3%						118,937	27.6	20.2	31.1	50.6	21.8	43,470	14.0
	25	6.8%						44,468	12.8	26.4	43.3	68.7	18.5	9,694	17.0
8		651,619	77.2	5.6	13.0	18.4	4.4	358,121	6.2	249,570	69.7%	22.3	77.7		
	2	3.9%						25,290	41.7	16.3	41.2	57.0	1.4	8,893	12.2
	7	9.9%						64,414	63.5	7.8	18.5	26.0	10.5	32,165	9.9
	8	85.0%						553,586	80.7	4.8	11.0	15.6	3.7	312,801	5.6
	18	0.0%						0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0%
	29	1.3%						8,329	57.8	13.8	16.8	30.4	11.8	4,262	7.9
9		651,619	60.1	21.8	14.4	35.9	4.0	361,761	8.0	276,726	76.5%	46.1	53.9		
	8	0.1%						339	90.9	2.4	3.2	5.6	3.5	236	2.2
	9	97.5%						635,307	59.8	22.2	14.4	36.3	3.9	352,224	8.0
	22	2.5%						15,973	73.2	5.9	14.7	20.3	6.5	9,301	8.8
	25	0.0%						0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0%
10		651,619	49.7	11.8	33.0	44.4	5.9	326,012	17.9	221,240	67.9%	53.4	46.6		
	10	100.0%						651,619	49.7	11.8	33.0	44.4	5.9	326,012	17.9

Area is not assigned to any district in this plan.

In most contests, election results do not include results from third party, independent, or write-in candidates. Complete official results are maintained by the office of the secretary of state.

* "Statewides" is a weighted average of the results of all general election statewide contested contests.

RED-M340
 Data: 2000 Census
 PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42
 PLAN 01000C 02/09/01 15:43:47

PLAN OVERLAP ANALYSIS
CONGRESSIONAL and CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS
 PLAN 01151C Compared with PLAN 01000C

Texas Legislative Council
 11/13/01 11:22 AM
 Page 2 of 4

PLAN 01151C DISTRICT	PLAN 01000C	2000 CENSUS							2000 GENERAL ELECTION *						
		TOTAL POPULATION						VOTER REG		TURNOUT		STATEWIDE**			
		TOTAL	%A	%B	%H	%B+H	%O	TOTAL	%SPAN	TOTAL	TO/VR	%DEM	%REP		
11		651,620	64.2	16.7	16.4	32.5	3.1	308,028	9.0	197,334	64.1%	35.4	64.6		
	11 92.6%	603,614	63.0	17.7	16.4	33.6	3.5	280,259	9.1	176,953	63.1%	36.6	63.4		
	14 1.8%	11,898	60.9	7.8	30.0	37.5	1.6	4,988	18.5	3,196	64.1%	35.4	64.6		
	21 5.5%	36,108	85.0	2.1	11.7	13.7	1.3	22,781	5.5	17,185	75.4%	23.7	76.3		
12		651,619	71.4	4.9	19.9	24.6	4.0	317,004	8.8	217,987	68.8%	33.6	66.4		
	6 37.0%	240,791	82.0	4.1	9.2	13.2	4.8	133,377	5.3	97,529	73.1%	26.9	73.1		
	12 63.0%	410,828	65.2	5.4	26.1	31.0	3.5	183,627	11.3	120,458	65.6%	39.0	61.0		
13		651,619	70.0	6.1	21.6	27.4	2.6	342,809	10.9	214,103	62.5%	28.1	71.9		
	13 73.2%	477,120	68.5	7.7	21.2	28.7	2.8	247,909	11.4	150,917	60.9%	31.7	68.3		
	19 26.8%	174,499	74.0	1.7	22.4	24.0	2.0	94,900	9.7	63,186	66.6%	39.5	80.5		
14		651,620	58.2	8.3	32.0	40.0	1.9	352,263	19.3	214,192	60.8%	36.8	63.2		
	14 75.9%	494,730	58.2	9.0	31.3	39.9	1.9	265,688	17.3	161,137	60.6%	38.6	61.4		
	15 5.4%	35,459	52.1	11.2	36.0	46.8	1.1	18,278	29.2	10,501	57.5%	33.3	66.7		
	21 9.0%	58,357	67.4	4.4	25.7	29.9	2.7	32,869	16.6	22,344	68.0%	25.7	74.3		
	28 9.7%	63,074	52.7	4.3	41.8	45.8	1.4	35,428	32.0	20,210	57.0%	36.3	63.7		
15		651,619	19.2	1.6	78.3	79.6	1.1	291,995	65.5	146,537	50.2%	54.0	46.0		
	15 95.6%	622,841	18.1	1.6	79.4	80.8	1.1	275,622	66.6	136,609	49.6%	55.0	45.0		
	27 4.4%	28,778	43.5	1.4	53.8	55.0	1.5	16,373	46.9	9,928	60.6%	41.7	58.3		
16		651,619	17.4	3.6	77.7	80.7	1.9	296,314	64.8	145,016	48.9%	57.2	42.8		
	16 93.8%	611,500	17.3	3.5	77.8	80.8	1.9	282,582	65.2	139,015	49.2%	57.4	42.6		
	23 6.2%	40,119	18.2	5.1	75.4	79.9	2.0	13,732	57.7	6,001	43.7%	51.1	48.9		
17		651,619	74.7	4.2	19.6	23.6	1.8	355,007	11.3	228,577	64.4%	31.4	68.6		
	11 3.1%	7,139	68.7	1.8	28.8	30.4	0.9	4,041	18.5	2,478	61.3%	32.7	67.3		
	13 0.7%	4,529	56.1	5.3	38.0	43.0	0.9	2,516	23.0	1,663	66.1%	30.3	69.7		
	17 89.1%	580,328	74.5	4.4	19.6	23.7	1.7	314,516	11.2	199,587	63.5%	32.3	67.7		
	21 9.1%	59,623	78.0	3.0	17.1	19.9	2.1	33,934	10.3	24,849	73.2%	23.6	76.4		
18		651,620	21.2	43.0	32.6	75.1	3.6	329,959	13.1	196,693	59.6%	73.5	26.5		
	7 0.2%	1,130	88.8	1.7	5.1	6.7	4.4	905	3.3	693	76.6%	21.7	78.3		
	8 0.0%	2	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0		
	18 93.1%	606,441	22.3	40.9	33.4	73.8	3.8	302,684	13.6	180,124	59.5%	72.0	28.0		
	25 5.2%	33,678	3.3	74.4	21.9	95.8	0.8	19,588	8.6	12,009	61.3%	91.6	8.4		
	29 1.6%	10,369	6.7	70.0	23.1	92.8	0.5	6,782	6.3	3,867	57.0%	92.7	7.3		
19		651,619	58.2	6.1	34.1	40.0	1.8	328,344	22.9	202,843	61.8%	26.7	73.3		
	13 9.7%	63,151	29.3	17.3	53.0	69.7	1.1	31,511	45.5	13,890	44.1%	47.8	52.2		
	17 5.9%	38,173	56.8	4.1	37.8	41.6	1.6	18,882	22.4	11,710	62.0%	32.7	67.3		
	19 66.5%	433,036	66.5	4.0	27.6	31.4	2.1	221,245	17.3	144,260	65.2%	22.6	77.4		
	21 5.3%	34,704	80.2	2.8	15.5	18.2	1.7	20,496	8.2	14,845	72.4%	13.8	86.2		
	23 12.6%	82,355	28.3	11.3	59.8	70.7	1.0	36,210	45.7	18,138	50.1%	50.5	49.5		
20		651,619	23.7	6.2	68.2	73.8	2.5	312,766	59.4	157,181	50.3%	56.0	44.0		
	20 95.6%	622,910	24.6	6.5	67.0	72.9	2.5	296,616	57.9	150,927	50.9%	55.1	44.9		
	28 4.4%	28,709	5.2	0.6	94.0	94.3	0.5	16,150	87.2	6,254	38.7%	78.1	21.9		

* Area is not assigned to any district in this plan.

** In most contests, election results do not include results from third party, independent, or write-in candidates. Complete official results are maintained by the office of the secretary of state.

** "Statewide" is a weighted average of the results of all general election statewide contested contests.

PLAN OVERLAP ANALYSIS
 CONGRESSIONAL and CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS
 PLAN 01151C Compared with PLAN 01000C

Texas Legislative Council
 11/13/01 11:22 AM
 Page 3 of 4

DISTRICT	PLAN 01151C	2000 CENSUS							2000 GENERAL ELECTION *						
		TOTAL POPULATION						VOTER REG		TURNOUT		STATEWIDE**			
		TOTAL	%A	%B	%H	%B+H	%O	TOTAL	%SPAN	TOTAL	TO/VR	%DEM	%DEM	%REP	
21		651,619	77.2	2.4	17.2	19.5	3.4	411,296	10.7	298,302	72.5%	27.5	72.5		
	10	21.4%		139,498	82.2	1.8	9.0	10.8	7.0	89,240	6.0	69,885	78.3%	32.7	67.3
	14	10.7%		69,892	85.4	1.0	11.8	12.7	1.9	46,838	6.5	34,438	73.5%	27.3	72.7
	20	0.0%		164	50.0	9.1	37.2	44.5	5.5	82	24.8	53	64.6%	32.2	67.8
	21	64.8%		422,422	75.7	2.8	19.2	21.8	2.5	264,987	11.8	188,519	71.2%	25.3	74.7
	23	0.2%		1,407	75.7	1.5	17.5	19.0	5.3	915	12.4	751	82.1%	22.3	77.7
	28	2.8%		18,236	42.1	3.0	53.4	56.1	1.8	9,234	48.7	4,636	50.2%	43.7	56.3
22		651,619	60.1	10.6	19.7	30.1	9.8	341,755	12.2	237,741	69.6%	31.9	68.1		
	14	0.0%		97	15.5	7.2	77.3	84.5	0.0	28	60.8	15	53.6%	56.1	43.9
	22	90.0%		586,220	58.3	11.6	20.1	31.5	10.3	305,203	12.4	213,794	70.0%	32.4	67.6
	25	10.0%		65,302	76.9	2.3	15.8	18.0	5.2	36,524	10.8	23,932	65.5%	27.2	72.8
23		651,619	29.8	1.8	66.8	68.2	1.9	329,668	53.8	185,630	56.3%	41.7	58.3		
	16	1.4%		9,347	7.5	0.5	91.9	92.0	0.5	2,666	75.0	1,303	48.9%	56.7	43.3
	21	0.5%		3,526	76.1	0.4	22.1	22.4	1.5	2,630	16.0	1,795	68.3%	23.8	76.2
	23	98.0%		638,746	29.9	1.8	66.6	68.2	1.9	324,372	53.9	182,532	56.3%	41.7	58.3
24		651,619	35.3	22.7	38.0	60.2	4.5	254,973	16.0	158,822	62.3%	53.9	46.1		
	6	16.0%		104,571	59.9	21.9	11.9	33.5	6.6	49,741	6.1	35,808	72.0%	36.7	63.3
	12	13.2%		86,019	32.1	23.2	40.9	63.7	4.2	32,055	18.5	20,062	62.6%	60.3	39.7
	24	69.0%		449,555	30.9	22.7	42.7	65.0	4.1	170,534	18.2	101,692	59.6%	58.5	41.5
	30	1.8%		11,474	9.3	21.7	68.2	89.6	1.1	2,643	30.5	1,260	47.7%	71.2	28.8
25		651,619	36.6	23.7	34.3	57.4	6.0	270,265	13.6	177,881	65.8%	50.8	49.2		
	7	10.0%		65,248	34.7	7.0	53.4	59.8	5.4	20,293	12.2	14,296	70.4%	36.1	63.9
	9	0.3%		1,653	56.0	12.0	30.9	42.6	1.4	834	12.4	481	57.7%	37.4	62.6
	22	9.8%		63,629	24.7	41.2	28.4	68.9	6.3	29,631	11.7	20,438	69.0%	65.4	34.6
	25	79.6%		518,816	38.1	23.7	32.6	55.8	6.1	218,491	14.0	142,052	65.0%	50.2	49.8
	29	0.3%		2,273	61.9	5.1	32.0	36.7	1.5	1,016	15.9	614	60.4%	46.9	53.1
26		651,619	77.8	5.5	11.0	16.3	5.8	328,100	4.9	235,435	71.8%	26.0	74.0		
	4	7.3%		47,546	82.5	3.7	11.2	14.8	2.7	23,289	4.3	15,907	68.3%	31.1	68.9
	6	18.6%		121,333	80.9	4.1	8.2	12.2	6.9	65,593	4.6	49,760	75.9%	24.8	75.2
	12	2.3%		15,068	57.6	10.2	17.9	27.8	14.6	5,304	8.9	3,215	60.6%	40.0	60.0
	13	8.0%		52,208	63.1	11.3	20.1	31.2	5.7	19,936	6.5	13,074	65.6%	45.9	54.1
	17	0.0%		257	86.4	1.2	11.3	12.5	1.2	114	3.6	74	64.9%	35.2	64.8
	26	63.7%		415,207	79.0	5.2	10.4	15.4	5.6	213,864	4.8	153,405	71.7%	23.9	76.1
27		651,619	24.6	2.6	71.6	73.9	1.5	296,993	60.3	158,586	53.4%	51.1	48.9		
	15	2.5%		15,969	10.0	2.7	86.9	89.4	0.6	7,903	81.2	4,159	52.6%	64.4	35.6
	27	97.5%		635,650	25.0	2.6	71.2	73.5	1.5	289,090	59.7	154,427	53.4%	50.8	49.2
28		651,620	21.2	8.2	69.6	77.3	1.5	320,383	58.4	156,543	48.9%	59.0	41.0		
	15	16.3%		106,041	10.4	0.3	89.0	89.2	0.5	31,579	73.3	15,557	49.3%	61.7	38.3
	20	0.2%		1,310	36.3	0.8	62.0	62.7	1.1	946	48.3	647	68.4%	67.4	32.6
	21	1.2%		8,127	71.1	8.6	17.5	25.7	3.2	6,060	9.1	4,578	75.5%	28.0	72.0
	28	82.3%		536,142	22.5	9.7	66.6	75.8	1.7	281,798	57.8	135,761	48.2%	59.7	40.3
29		651,620	20.0	15.3	62.2	77.1	2.9	219,677	39.8	114,214	52.0%	60.6	39.4		
	29	100.0%		651,620	20.0	15.3	62.2	77.1	2.9	219,677	39.8	114,214	52.0%	60.6	39.4
30		651,620	24.7	41.4	31.1	72.1	3.2	282,156	10.1	162,436	57.6%	68.5	31.5		
	5	1.5%		9,638	27.2	54.3	16.2	70.1	2.7	4,017	6.5	2,712	67.5%	61.3	38.7
	24	7.7%		50,040	47.3	38.3	12.4	50.3	2.4	25,645	6.6	17,252	67.3%	51.9	48.1
	30	90.8%		591,942	22.7	41.5	33.0	74.0	3.3	252,494	10.6	142,472	56.4%	70.7	29.3

Area is not assigned to any district in this plan.

* In most contests, election results do not include results from third party, independent, or write-in candidates. Complete official results are maintained by the office of the secretary of state.

** "Statewide" is a weighted average of the results of all general election statewide contested contests.

RED-M340
 Date: 2000 Census
 PLAN 01151C 11/13/01 10:56:42
 PLAN 01000C 02/09/01 15:43:47

PLAN OVERLAP ANALYSIS
CONGRESSIONAL and CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS
 PLAN 01151C Compared with PLAN 01000C

Texas Legislative Council
 11/13/01 11:22 AM
 Page 4 of 4

DISTRICT	PLAN 01151C	2000 CENSUS						2000 GENERAL ELECTION *					
		TOTAL POPULATION			VOTER REG			TURNOUT			STATEWIDE**		
		TOTAL	%A	%B	%H	%B+H	%O	TOTAL	%SPAN	TOTAL	TO/VR	%DEM	%REP
31		651,620	69.4	9.6	16.9	26.2	4.4	326,715	8.5	233,747	71.5%	29.7	70.3
	5 3.8%	24,997	22.1	32.9	44.5	77.0	0.9	7,886	27.3	5,320	67.5%	48.3	51.7
	7 23.5%	153,140	73.8	5.6	14.7	20.2	6.0	81,904	7.8	59,708	72.9%	21.6	78.4
	8 28.1%	183,285	74.3	8.9	12.2	21.0	4.7	84,592	5.6	63,578	75.2%	28.0	72.0
	14 17.2%	111,987	59.4	17.1	22.6	39.4	1.2	58,733	9.6	36,731	62.5%	43.5	56.5
	21 27.3%	178,211	73.6	5.5	16.1	21.4	5.0	93,600	9.4	68,410	73.1%	29.2	70.8
32		651,619	55.2	9.7	27.4	36.9	7.9	295,400	7.7	207,640	70.3%	33.6	66.4
	3 18.7%	121,889	43.7	19.5	24.1	43.2	13.1	49,225	5.5	31,707	64.4%	40.5	59.5
	5 15.7%	102,327	40.7	9.6	45.6	54.9	4.4	38,523	17.1	25,512	66.2%	52.6	47.4
	6 0.0%	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0%	0.0	0.0
	26 62.6%	407,715	63.9	6.9	22.4	29.0	7.1	203,223	6.3	148,185	72.9%	28.7	71.3
	30 3.0%	19,688	22.3	9.0	58.6	67.2	10.5	4,429	18.4	2,236	50.5%	47.2	52.8

area is not assigned to any district in this plan.

In most contests, election results do not include results from third party, independent, or write-in candidates. Complete official results are maintained by the office of the secretary of state.

"Statewide" is a weighted average of the results of all general election statewide contested contests.

RED-M350
Data: 2000 Census Geography
PLAN 01151C 10/13/01 10:56:42

INCUMBENTS BY DISTRICT
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS - PLAN 01151C






Texas Legislative Council
10/13/01 11:24 AM
Page 1 of 1


DISTRICT	INCUMBENT
1	Sandlin - D
2	Turner - D
3	Johnson, S. - R
4	Holl - D
5	Sessions - R
6	Barton - R
7	Culberson - R
8	Brady - R
9	Lampson - D
10	Doggett - D
11	Edwards - D
12	Granger - R
13	Thornberry - R
14	Paul - R
15	Hinojosa - D
16	Reyes - D
17	Stenholm - D
18	Jackson Lee - D
19	Combs - R
20	Gonzalez - D
21	Smith - R
22	DeLay - R
23	Bonilla - R
24	Frost - D
25	Bentsen - D
26	Arney - R
27	Ortiz - D
28	Rodriguez - D
29	Green - D
30	Johnson, E.B. - D
31	n/a
32	n/a

Congressional Districts for 2002 Election
as Ordered by the Eastern District of Texas
Federal Three-Judge Panel, November 14, 2001

PLAN01151C

EXHIBIT B





TEXAS
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151C

LEGEND

plan 01151C


Counties

Incorporated
1990 VTDs


plan 01151C
11/7/01 10:56:42

SPPC: 11406
Scale: 1:493,022
1 inch = 78.52 miles
November 16, 2001 8:30 AM





plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:35:42



BASTROP COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C

LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Interstates	_____
1990 VTDs	_____

590002 11406
Scale 1:265657
1 inch = 4.2 miles
November 14, 2001 8:45 AM




TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL



plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:56:42

BEXAR COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Islands	_____
1990 VTDs	_____


SDHC 11405
Scale 1:293039
1 inch = 4.62 miles
November 14, 2001 8:46 AM





plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:56:42

BRAZORIA COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Intertables	_____
1990 VTDs	_____

SSWUC 11406
Scale 1:380,000
1 inch = 3.53 miles
November 14, 2001 8:47 AM



COLLIN COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

PLAN 01151 C State
Counties —
Incorporations —
1990 VTDs —


SDOC 11-06
SDOC 11-07
1 inch = 3.13 miles
November 14, 2001 8 AM





plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:56:42

DALLAS COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Interstates	_____
1990 VTDs	_____


5900C 11406
Scale 1 : 213190
1 inch = 3.36 miles
November 16, 2001 8:45 AM





plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:56:42

EL PASO COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Intertables	_____
1990 VTDs	_____

5900C 11406
Scale 1:274200
1 inch = 4.33 miles
November 14, 2001 2:46 AM



FORT BEND COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C



LEGEND


plan 01151 C shaded
County
Interstate
1990 VTDs

plan 01151 C
110 301 10.56-42



1990C 11406
Scale 1: 140,000
1 inch = 3.88 miles
November 14, 2001 8:47 AM

CARZA COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C



LEGEND


plan #1151C shaded _____
Country _____
Institution _____
1998 VITD4



כט' טבת תרנ"ג


JyotiCET 11406
Serial No.: 10000001
Length: 3.18 miles
November 14, 2009 08:48 AM

The image consists of two main sections. The upper section is predominantly black, with a vertical strip of white space on the far left containing the word "DICTENS" at the top and "CROSBY" below it. The lower section is a high-contrast, black-and-white graphic. It features a jagged, wavy line on the left side. A diagonal line runs from the bottom-left towards the center. In the center, there is a small, dark rectangular area with the number "13" written vertically within it. The bottom portion of the image is a grainy, textured area with some faint markings.



plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:58:42

HAYS COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND


plan 01151 C	shaded
County	_____
Intertable	_____
1990 VTDs	_____

SDCC 11406
Scale 1 : 249950
1 inch = 3.96 miles
November 14, 2001 0:46 AM






HARRIS COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

Plan 01151 C	shaded
County	—————
Incorporated	—————
1990 VTD	—————


plan 01151 C
11/1/2001 10:56:42
5900C : 1140K
Scale 1 : 377851
1 inch = 5.96 miles
November 14, 2001 8:45 AM





plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:56:42

HIDALGO COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Interstate	_____
1990 VTDs	_____


SDKC 11406
Scale 1 : 320041
1 inch = 5.06 miles
November 14, 2001 8:42 AM



TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL



HUNT COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
County	_____
Interstate	_____
1990 VTDs	_____


1100C 11406
Scale 1:213422
1 Inch = 3.37 miles
November 14, 2001 10:36 AM





Plan 01151 C 11/13/01 10:56:42

KAUFMAN COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Intertables	_____
1990 VTDs	_____

5900C 11406
Scale 1:192152
1 inch = 3.04 miles
November 14, 2001 8:15 AM







KLEBERG COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C

LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Incorporated	_____
1990 VTDs	_____


plan 01151 C 1/1/2001 10:56:42





plan 01151 C 110301 10:56:42

LAMB COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND


plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interstate	<input type="checkbox"/>
1990 VTDs	<input type="checkbox"/>

5900C 11406
Scale 1:217488
1 inch = 3.43 miles
November 14, 2001 8:47 AM





MCLENNAN COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND


PLAN 01151 C	Actual
Current
Proposed
1990 VTD

PLAN 01151 C
(10/20) 10/16/01




10/16/01
November 16, 2001 PUBLISHED





plan 01151 C 11/16/01 10:56:42

NACOGDOCHES COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Interties	_____
1990 VTDs	_____

1990C 11406
Scale 1:260,000
1 inch = 4.51 miles
November 16, 2001 10:56 AM






NUECES COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C


PLAN 01151 C 11/13/01 10:36:42

LEGEND

PLAN 01151 C	shaded
Counties	—
Intertables	—
1990 VTDs	—




3500C 11406
Scale 1: 274254
1 inch = 4.36 miles
November 14, 2001 8:47 AM
Texas Legislative Council



PLAN 01151 C 11/13/01 10:54:42

TARRANT COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C




LEGEND

Plan 01151 C	shaded
Counties	_____
Interstates	_____
1998 VTDs	_____

JSDDC 11406
Scale 1:210747
1 inch = 3.33 miles
November 16, 2001 9:48 AM



TRAVIS COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C



LEGEND

Shaded
Plan 01151 C
Census
Interstate
190 VTD

Plan 01151 C
01151 C

01151 C

01151 C

01151 C

01151 C


01151 C

01151 C

SDRC 1100
Scale 1:251,440
1 Inch = .44 miles
November 14, 2001 2:58 AM



TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL



WILLIAMSON COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C


LEGEND

Plan Dist C	shaded
County	-----
Interstate	-----
1998 VTDs	-----




PLAN 01151 C 11/1/2001 10:16:47

5000C 11406
Scale 1 : 300,000
1 inch = 7.5 miles
November 14, 2001 8:04 AM
TLC TEXAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL



13 - 1000 METERS

WISE COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151C




PLAN 01151C
Scale 1:201,600
Internals
1990 VTDs


PLAN 01151C
17,200 10,164.2



1990
Scale 1:201,600
Internals
1990 VTDs
November 4, 2001 4:2 PM



FORT BEND COUNTY
U.S. Congressional Districts
Proposed Plan - PLAN 01151 C



LEGEND

Cities 2000	shaded
Counties	white
Interstates	solid line
plan 01151 C	line with dots

5002C 11406
Scale 1: 240,000
1 Inch = 3.68 miles
November 14, 2001 8:49 AM

